

### Voting of Demands for Grants.

#### I. 14—General Administration—Rs. 71,065.

**President.**—We shall now proceed with the voting of Demands for Grants. First, General Administration.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Sir, I beg to move for an allotment of Rs. 71,065 under Demand No. XIV—General Administration. General Administration, in Cochin, Sir, is the central administration. Much of the general remarks that were made by the Hon'ble Members yesterday and day before yesterday refer particularly to that aspect of our Government. I don't mean to traverse the same ground as the House has passed through the last two days, but I think that, in fairness to the office that I represent, I should make, as much information as is possible, available to the House. I should touch a few, the main leading aspects of the general administration of to-day. Its policies, are so well-known to the public that it would be superfluous and even silly on my part to elaborate them here. We have no policies that are secret or confidential. Whatever is done in the Huzur is done before the public.

While acknowledging with thanks on behalf of the administration the many kind remarks that the House was pleased to make, I should first say that our watchword all along has been fairness to everybody concerned. I mention this because there was a reference on the part of some of the Hon'ble Members about the way the income-tax and the salary cut of the officers have been combined. It would appear that by combining the two as was done in the Diwan's Proceedings C. 14731 of 23rd July 1932 some of the officers in the higher grades will ultimately be slightly more benefited. It may be that this is true and that this anomaly has to be set right. But no definite opinion can be volunteered till we go into those details much more definitely, till we work out the exact figures, till we know by how much there is the comparative difference pointed out by some of the Hon'ble Members. But on one thing I should be clear and that is that nothing was farther from the mind of the Government than anything of the kind the Hon'ble Members tried to suggest. I would refer to the first two or three sentences of the Proceedings published in the Cochin Government Gazette two weeks ago. Government thought that the cut was necessary because the Income-tax Bill could not be introduced as early as the Government wished.

“The tax will be introduced into the State for the first time next year and although the estimated receipts from it have been based on the best material available the figure is in the circumstances necessarily tentative particularly as collections can only be made after the Income-tax Bill becomes law towards the middle of the year. In these circumstances and in

view of the continuance of the trade depression which may result in the reduction of receipts under other heads it seemed essential to the Government to effect further economies so as to ensure that the year's transactions shall not result in a deficit".

It was this which immediately led them to the salary cut and when that was done, is there anything more logical and more fair, I would ask the Hon'ble Members, than to say that when the income-tax is collected and is found to be ample the salary cut should be restored and till then both should be regarded as part and parcel of one and the same scheme? So I would say it was from the very logic of the situation that this condition had to be imposed in the Diwan's Proceedings and this I refer to simply to clear the minds of any of the Hon'ble Members of the House as to how it came to be mixed up.

Again, Sir, it is the policy of the Government to consult public opinion on all possible occasions. The responsiveness that the Leader of the House explained yesterday at great detail and the case with which we have acceded to the request of the House and to the wishes and aspirations of the House bear ample testimony to it. But again I mention this with a particular reference namely, that in the matter of such important developments as Harbour and Railways public is kept out of the know of things. Sir, if we are not able to consult them, it is not because that we want to do things in our own way or that we do not want to exert ourselves as much as we should. It is simply because the situation is very delicate. From the very nature of the parties and their comparative position the Hon'ble Members should know that extreme tact and care are required on our part in the discussions. In handling such a situation it would be rather difficult for any Government to go and consult public opinion at every stage. Public opinion should have confidence to some extent in the administration of the State and if public opinion thinks at any stage that they have been betrayed then alone it will be right for them to accuse the Government of not having behaved correctly. Till then public opinion should have confidence in the Government. I may add that we have not the least objection to issue press communiques as situations clear and as stages arise where such communiques could profitably be issued.

Coming to the Railway one word more and that is one of the Hon'ble Members suggested that a senior officer might be appointed to supervise the work of the Company. I would submit that even now the Government have ample powers to look into the estimates prepared by the Company. The Company does the work as our paid Agents and there are specific terms

under which they work and we can look into these terms and they are to submit their estimates. According to the agreement those estimates are verified by our experts. Our objections are duly considered and only on mutual consultation are final results arrived at.

More than all these there is the British Government Auditor of Railways whose duty it will be, as well, to look into the accounts of our conversion. So, there need be no anxiety in the mind of the public or the Members of this House about the way in which the conversion is being carried on.

One point more and I have done. That would be with regard to the constitutional changes that the Hon'ble Members referred to. If we have not made any radical changes in the constitution it is not because we are afraid of checks. This House itself is a sufficient check to any administration. The House constituted, as it is, with a majority of non-official Members who can, if they wish, defeat the Government (*Hear, hear,*) at any time, with such a House to question the Government I do not know what further check is necessary.

**Mr. George Chakyamuri.**—Many thanks for the compliment.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—It is not a vain compliment. It is a fact, and I gave expression to this even on the first occasion I was present here. Therefore it is Sir, not because we are afraid of checks that we have not made far-reaching alterations to the Government. Of course we admit consultation is very useful and wherever consultation is required we are having consultations with all the leading people required. Consultation with Heads of Departments almost periodically takes place in the Diwan's room in the Secretariat. It has been made a rule that once in every three months a meeting of the Heads of Departments should be arranged to consider general questions and questions relating to T. A. Salary, etc. All questions of a general interest and any particular question which any particular Head of Department may like to raise will be conjointly considered by the Heads of Departments and the Diwan. Therefore it should not be presumed that Government as it is constituted is devoid of the benefits of mutual consultation. I do not want to take up the time of the House by treading on any further grounds. Had I time, I would have pleasantly undertaken it.

The figures as they stand do not require much elucidation. The details are mere repetitions of the previous year's figures. The one minor head that might require a word of explanation is about the Census Operations. The census work is almost complete and we have made provision only for two months' pay for Karkadagam and Chingam. No other figure requires any

special mention and if there is any further information or detail required, I would only be too glad to supply them

### Motion No. 1.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—Sir, I move *to reduce the allotment of Rs. 43,587 for Establishment—Huzur Secretariat by Re. 1.* The object of my motion is to bring to the notice of the Government the necessity of continuing the Economic Development Committee. Sir, the Economic Development Committee has been practically scraped though they say that they have only suspended it for one year. Next year they may say "Oh! we managed without it for one year, why continue it and waste public funds." I am afraid that the Government has even scraped the method and principle underlying it. It is this fear more than anything else that prompted me to table this motion.

Our Economic Development Committee consists of some of the officers, *i. e.*, the Heads of Departments like the Chief Engineer, Director of Public Instruction, Agricultural Superintendent, Registrar of Co-operative Societies, etc., and a few non-official members drawn from the industrial and commercial classes. Their function is mainly advisory. General questions affecting the industries and commerce and the economic welfare of the State are referred to them and they submit their reports to the Government. If my information is correct, this Committee has done a lot of thankless work. Some of their suggestions have been very helpful to the Government and they have accepted many. In fact this is the only expert body in the State, if I may call it so, that has bestowed some thought about the economic development in the State. I do not know what exactly is the reason that made the Government to suspend the working of the Committee this year. If it is merely from a desire to cut the expenditure, may I tell them that they are unconsciously laying the axe upon the tender roots of a beautiful and useful plant.

Again, I may also tell them that they have selected an inauspicious occasion for this. The whole world is groaning under an economic depression, the like of which had not seen the light of day before and some of its best men are racking their brains to find a solution for it. This House itself had been repeatedly asking the Government to have a Development Department, but was very complacently told that it would involve additional expenditure and that they could not afford it until the present economic depression is over. And after all, they ask, what will it serve except probably to create some more new posts? So long

as the Council has no power to enforce its decisions, it will have to rest content by swallowing answers like the above. In spite of all that the Hon'ble Secretary to the Diwan said a few minutes ago that the Council enjoys real powers, the fact remains to my humble mind otherwise. All progressive States except "the little progressive Cochin" have their own Development Departments and are serving purposes other than the payment of a few officers. Our sister State of Travancore is making a very decent provision in the next year's budget for the economic development of the country, for the creation of a sales Department in Trivandrum and establishment of co-operation with similar depots in Mysore, Allahabad, Patna and Lahore for restoring the decaying cottage industries and the appointment of a trade Agent in London. Sir, may I respectfully ask whether the abolition or suspension, whatever it may be, of the Economic Development Committee in order to save a paltry sum of Rs. 1,000 out of 84 lakhs is our answer to what Travancore is doing in this matter?

Sir, this cut of Rs. 1,000 appears to me to be the unkindest cut of all. It goes much deeper than is intended. The original Committee might have been ill-composed. I am prepared to concede for argument's sake that they might have wasted funds and would not have functioned properly. But that is no reason why we should end it. It is pre-eminently a case where we should mend it and make it do more useful work until at last we are in a position to have a separate Development Department. With these few words I commend this motion for the acceptance of the House.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—Sir, I support the motion. It is neither to-day nor this year that this House requested the Government to open a Commercial Department. Time after time they were holding out promises of creating one. Your predecessor instead of granting to commerce something that would support them and guide in their days of prosperity as well as in their days of adversity abolished the only seat that commerce had in this Council. He however made that good by appointing the Economic Development Committee. We are very thankful to your Secretary for the very fine words he has said about public opinion and the ascertainment of public opinion. But I ask what is the way that the Government has to ascertain public opinion at present regarding several matters bearing on industries. We have no Department of Industries in our State and the only method by which something can be done to industries was through the channel of the Economic Development Committee. In reports after reports the Government have said that the Econo-

mic Development Committee has been doing good work. In the Administration Report for 1106 it is stated that "the Economic Development Committee has been doing very useful work during the year." When the whole world turns to industries and in Cochin itself you are putting your hands into the development of industries in the State, why should you at this stage, scrape off this Committee. The Committee may cost about Rs. 2,500 a year. That is not much. As a machinery however rough and unfinished it may be, for the industrialists of the Cochin State, to ventilate their grievances and to bring their views before the Government, the Economic Development Committee will serve a useful purpose. Till we organise a development department or a department of commerce, this Committee of Economic Development has to continue.

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—Sir, I am sorry I cannot see eye to eye with the Hon'ble Member for Urakam. Last year in the course of my speech on the budget I had occasion to say that the Economic Development Committee ought to be scraped. These three words are no doubt high sounding and pregnant with potentialities for good; but the Economic Development Committee has been very Economic in their deliberations and very economic in their suggestions. It has been doing absolutely nothing, except recommending the distribution of prizes to a few favoured individuals and institutions. The Economic Development Committee, so far as I have been able to understand its proceedings, from issues of the Gazette, published once perhaps every three or four months, has not carried out anything worth noting by the Government. I have not seen any single suggestion of theirs carried out, that has been of any practical utility whatever. I therefore suggested last year that the Economic Development Committee must be scraped altogether. There was no question of mending it. It is a question of ending it absolutely. I suggested to Government to open a useful institution like the Department for Trade, Industry and Commerce, inasmuch as therein lay our salvation with the development of the Harbour and the Railway. A department of trade, commerce and industry is the proper thing for which the Government must pay special attention. There are people in the State endowed with business instincts, but lacking in capital. The warehouse arrangements would be admirably suited for present conditions and for conditions likely to arise in Cochin. People might thus be enabled to engage themselves in trade and commerce. And to those who have no working capital we may advance money. There is no risk or loss whatever in this matter. So that in stead of continuing this Com-

mittee, I think the suspension of it is a step in the right direction and the ending of it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished.

**Mr. George Chakyamuri.**—Sir, I am also one of those who had occasion to say that this Economic Development Committee has to be scraped. A question was then put to the Hon'ble Member for Education as to the work that was being done by this Economic Development Committee, and the answer was that they have made certain suggestions with regard to the keeping of bees in the State. I had also occasion then to observe that if, after deliberations for a number of years and after having spent so much money on that, they have been able only to suggest to the Government this one idea, it is high time that this Economic Development Committee be scraped. There is no use of finding fault with the Government now, because I remember many other Hon'ble Members were of the same view then. Government wanted to find out some way of balancing the Budget and taking away things that were not absolutely necessary and this of course is one way of doing it. Further it is in deference to the definite wishes of this House that it has been done and now to take the Government to task for that will not be proper. There is no use of our complaining that Government is not responsive to public opinion if when they respond to it we find fault with them. The Hon'ble Member for Anthikad said that the Government themselves have said that the Economic Development Committee was doing useful work and so the Government was not justified in scraping it now. I beg to state that in Administration Reports they are bound to say such things as long as they are maintaining it. Such statements by the Government should not be taken very seriously and the Government should not be taken to task for such statements. (*Laughter*). Everywhere the Government is bound to say that everything is going on smoothly and well. Otherwise the Hon'ble Members themselves will take them to task for that. This is the way by which they justify such institutions. But that does not mean that the Government are convinced of its usefulness. In view of the charge that this Committee has not done any useful work till now, the Government acted very properly in suspending it for the time being. With regard to the question of the development of industries this Economic Development Committee is not the proper body to deal with the question. We want expert opinion and expert committees. This Committee of people from here and there would not be able to advise the Government in developing industries. If they were able to do something they would have done it long ago. They had sufficient time to advise the Government on

that matter and after all, Sir, these Committees are mere copies, mere imitations from the neighbouring States. Of course to a certain extent we are bound to imitate also and when we find that the imitation is absolutely useless there is nothing wrong in giving it up in good time. With these observations I strongly oppose the motion.

മിസ്റ്റർ. കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.— ഞാനും ഇതിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നു. ഇപ്പോൾ ഈ കമ്മിറ്റി പ്രയോജനകരമായ ഒരു വേലയും ചെയ്യുന്നില്ലെന്ന് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. ഇപ്പോൾ കമ്മിറ്റി ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള പ്രയോജനകരമായ വേലകൾ കമ്മിറ്റിയിലെ അനുഭാഗങ്ങൾ മെമ്പർമാർക്ക് നിയമസഭാംഗങ്ങളുടെ നിലയിലും, ഗവണ്മെന്റ് മെമ്പർമാർക്ക് അവരുടെ സ്വന്തം നിലയിലും ചെയ്യുവാൻ സാധിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ കമ്മിറ്റി വേണ്ടിയിട്ടേക്കാം. പ്രയോജനകരമായ ഒരു സ്ഥാപനമാണെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ സാരമായി വല്ലതും ചെയ്യണമെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ വളരെ ഉറപ്പുക കൊടുത്ത് ഒരു എക്സ്പെർട്ട് വിഭാഗം വാങ്ങണം. അതിനു സാധിക്കാത്ത കാലംവരെ ചിലർ ചിലർയായി പണം ചിലവാക്കിയതുകൊണ്ട് നാം ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന പ്രയോജനങ്ങളൊന്നും തന്നെ ഉണ്ടാകുകയില്ല. അതിനാൽ ഞാൻ ഇതിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നു.

**Mr. K. G. Nayar.**—Sir, I also oppose this motion for bringing to the attention of the Government the necessity of continuing the Economic Development Committee. Personally I am not a believer in the constitution of very many committees, and of late it has been so in the State that very many committees are formed and much of our revenue is wasted on these committees without proportionate benefits being derived either to the Government or to the public and the very fact that this Committee after having been appointed some time back has not been able to achieve the object with which such a Committee was appointed, is itself a justification for the complete abolition or annihilation of the same. In the matter of the Economic Development of the State, however much we may form a Committee of a few officials and non-officials, it is not going to bring any fruit whatever as desired by the Government or the public, unless persons who are specially qualified in the matter of development of industries find a place in the Committee with a good deal of time at their disposal to work in that committee, after having training or experience in that branch of the industry on which they are called upon to give an opinion. Unless these things are there, there is no use of saying "As in other places we are also having an Economic Development Committee". There is absolutely no necessity so far as this Committee is concerned, in this State.

**Rama Varmah Tampuran.**—Sir, I do not want to say much about this. I would only refer you to the fact that the budget for 1108 has been a retrenchment budget. Wherever possible, Government have tried to economise. Our watchword in preparing next year's budget has been "keep down expenditure as far as possible". Consistent with that we cut down all possible chances of excess expenditure in the Departments. For example, in contingency, in purchase of stationery articles, in purchase of books—these are the several sources where it is possible that something more than what is actually required is likely to be spent—in all these sources cuts have been effected as heavily as possible. These having been exhausted, we had perforce to resort to such heads as the Economic Development Committee and a few other similar heads. If we had cut down this particular head and budgetted for any of the other heads, then there would have been force in what the Hon'ble Member for Urakam said. If we had picked up this particular head excluding all the other heads where economy could be had without touching the interests of the State, then we would have been liable to be charged that we have missed the source for cut. We exhausted all other sources and then could not but take up some of these rather useful things. We have received a good number of suggestions from the Economic Development Committee and several of them are before the Government. Nothing very much is going to be lost by suspending the Committee for the next 8 or 10 months or even a year. We have at present ample schemes to consider. The situation has not changed very much in the last 12 months even with regard to the world depression through which the State is now passing. Therefore I do not see what further suggestions or what further improvements the Committee could have suggested within the next few months with regard to these general questions. That was the attitude which the Government took. I do not think that the House will consider that it was a very unreasonable attitude. Acknowledging the good work that the Committee has done in their own way I would painfully admit that it was a necessity for the Government to retrench even on such a head as this.

**Mr. I. N. Menon.**—Sir, just a word. Having been nebulously connected with this Committee as its President, I think I may be able to give matters of fact and matters of history. The question, Sir, is not whether this Committee was doing useful work or whether it was not doing useful work. It is a case of temporary suspension only and the question whether it was doing useful work or whether it is going to do useful work does not in my opinion arise at all. If the question were the abolition of the Economic Development Committee it would be

relevant. The only thing is that as a measure of economy, this item of expenditure which is not very urgent is kept in abeyance. Some Hon'ble Members said that this Economic Development Committee—which is composed of only one expert, I mean the Hon'ble Member for Adur—cannot reduce the acuteness of the present economic depression. So the attempt at connecting the present economic depression with the Economic Development Committee is not justifiable. As I said yesterday in this House we want something far more experienced than the present Industries Department and the Economic Development Department. There can be no harm whatsoever in suspending this Committee for a year, and that I think means no disparagement either to the work of the Committee in the past or to the Government which has now suspended it. I would not say anything, of course, about the consistency or the inconsistency of the measure as some of the Hon'ble Members have done, because I have always held that absolute consistency is a virtue only in the infallible.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—Sir, I am not going to plead for the restoration of the allotment for the Economic Development Committee. But since I understand that there are many Hon'ble Members in this House, who are not in touch with what the Committee has been doing recently, I should like to place before them a few facts relating to what the Committee has been doing so far, because after all, I understand that there is nothing so eloquent as the eloquence of facts. Before I proceed to a mere summary of what the Committee has been doing, I would like that the Hon'ble Members of this House be pleased to keep in view that after all the State is spending only a thousand rupees on this Committee for a year, though in the Budget you will find something more than two thousand rupees provided for it last year. For it must be noted that of this amount Rs. 1,000 was distributed as rewards and bonuses towards the encouragement of cottage industries and such other things. So for the personnel, for the establishment, as it were, of this Committee it is only just a thousand rupees that the Government are spending a year. This fact the Hon'ble Members will keep in view and then at the same time consider whether it is possible for the Government to do wonders simply by spending a thousand rupees on this score. I perfectly agree that if experts could be bought as the Hon'ble Member for South Ezhuvas said, if experts could be bought at an exorbitant price, perhaps, much more could be done. And I am also sure if there is a reconstitution of the Committee, spending much more on it than is done at present, more substantial results could be realised.

It is especially in these days of economic depression, that we want an institution like this to suggest ways and means of economic development. In these days when all over the world the economic development is one of the chief concerns of the respective Governments, it would not stand to reason and fairness if we, merely for the sake of a thousand rupees scrape this institution. The Government have been pleased to say that they have only suspended the Committee and that we are not going to lose much by suspending it for a year. I would simply bring to the notice of the Government that if that view is taken there might be many other items of Government expenditure which, if scraped, would not be bringing down anything very serious upon us; say, for instance, we have the department of Archaeology. I do not think we are going to lose much if that department is suspended for a year. We are having certain items of expenditure in the Agricultural Department which again could be omitted without causing any loss to the public. It has been the constant complaint of this House that no substantial benefit is accruing to the public on account of this department; and yet in deference to the wishes of this House the Government have not done anything by way of suspension or abolition of any of the activities of this department. I think it is, therefore, a petty thing, a very ungenerous thing for the Government to suspend this Committee simply to save a thousand rupees. But I do not want to proceed in this strain. I wanted only to remove the misunderstanding in the minds of the Hon'ble Members, as regards the activities of the Committee. The Committee has been in existence for some years, but I can speak authoritatively only for the last 2 years of its existence and during that period the Committee has done some useful work. I have not got here an official list of the many items of works done by the Committee, but I have jotted down a few of them from memory.

Once there was a proposal in this House, I think, of instituting an Irrigation Department in the State. The question was referred to the Committee; and after a very useful discussion on it, we submitted our report that no Department of Irrigation was necessary but only an irrigational section under the Chief Engineer. This proposal of ours—may be there was the same proposals from other quarters—was finally accepted and we have an irrigation section in the P. W. D. now.

Again, when there was a query about the manufacturing of cement in the State, the question was referred to the Committee. We carried out enquiries, submitted a report—a very detailed report. But then the Government did not find their way to act up to the report.

Again, the question regarding the future working of the Potteries was referred to the Committee. In this case, too, local inspection was made, and a report submitted, embodying a scheme calculated to make the Potteries a paying concern at least in a small way. Yet another line of work undertaken by the Committee was in connection with applications for industrial loans. Many such loans have been referred to the Committee by the Government; and in every case the Committee did go into every aspect of the question and make suitable recommendations.

Again, there was an idea some time ago, of having a broadcasting installation in the State. The Committee went into the matter thoroughly, discussed all the details thereof and submitted a scheme. The Government accepted it and perhaps it is still pending only because of the financial stringency that they plead.

Yet another scheme submitted by the Committee for the consideration of the Government was the introduction of Kodoscope into our Primary schools. Many of the Hon'ble Members here may not have any clear idea of a Kodoscope. It is a contrivance, somewhat similar to the cinema, intended to increase the efficiency of instruction with the help of moving pictures.

Again, there was the important question of making the Central Jail self-supporting. Again we went to the spot, conducted enquiries and submitted a scheme, which, if carried out, would have made a substantial addition to the income of the jail. There was also expert opinion to help us in the matter. But here again the Government have not found their way to act upon our report.

A compliment was given to me by the Hon'ble Member for Education that I was the only expert on the Economic Development Committee. Perhaps, he forgot Mr. Balarama Ayyar, a distinguished expert on matters Industrial and Commercial.

Again, as some of the Hon'ble Members have pointed out, we have been doing something towards the encouragement of bee-keeping in the State.

Another problem we sought to tackle was the question of improving the economic condition of the fishermen. Here again, a sub-committee was formed, which went into the question, collected all available statistics and submitted a scheme, embodying certain general lines of action.

**Mr. K. Ayyappan.**—What is the Fishery Department doing?

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—The Fishery Department is mainly concerned with the collection of the rental from fishing stakes and so on,

When the Census came on, we wanted that there should be an Economic Survey incorporated with it. We were asked to prepare forms for the same. Again, we set ourselves to the task, and prepared and furnished the necessary forms. The Census Commissioner, however, found that the information required was so technical, that it could not be collected along with the Census operations. Since then we have been urging for the conduct of an economic survey in the State. The Government have agreed upon the necessity of the survey, and asked the Committee to undertake the same under the supervision of the intelligence officer when he would be appointed.

This takes us to another reform the Committee has been pressing for, and that is the starting of an Economic and Intelligence Bureau in the State. We have been asked to go into the question and submit a report, which we did, whereupon the Government asked us to make provision for this bureau in the Economic Development Committee Budget of 1938. Accordingly we sent up a detailed budget for the starting of an Intelligence Bureau on a rather modest scale. Then comes the official sword cutting down not only the proposed offspring but the parent itself,—the Economic Development Committee—which, it would seem, has been found guilty of having proposed the opening of an Intelligence Bureau.

I think I have given sufficient details to show to the Hon'ble Members here that the Economic Development Committee has turned out some useful work and I presume that these Hon'ble Members, now that these facts have been placed before them, will perhaps think it fair to change the opinion they have hitherto entertained about the work of the Economic Development Committee.

Anyhow the Government have been kind to say that it is not on account of uselessness that they have suspended the Committee, but only because there is no urgent necessity for continuing its work during the next twelve months. This argument will take us to the further question on the financial stringency of the Government, which however I reserve for another occasion. Here I would only add that if the Committee is allowed to function, then the Government can at least occasionally expect from it valuable suggestions which they can make use of if they like. Also I may add that it is rather in the matter of advertisement than in the matter of useful work that the Committee has failed. The Committee has not been advertising what it has been doing so far. Hence it is that some of the Hon'ble Members here were not aware of its activities. I would just submit to the Government that if the Committee is given another

chance it will do more in the line of advertising its work, so that this difficulty may not arise again. I support this motion.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I do not want to say much. We have no idea of abolishing this at all. We do not question the usefulness of the work. If we were abolishing the Committee then the remarks of the member would have been more legitimate and more relevant. We are not doing that. We are only suspending it for a few months. No urgent problem is likely to arise within the next ten or twelve months. And therefore why not suspend the work of the Committee? It is from this aspect we have treated the question; and I think we have not done anything unreasonable.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—Sir, from the discussion that we had on this subject, I think that it is now fairly clear that there had been a lot of misunderstanding about the working of this Economic Development Committee. Perhaps this opposition itself may be on account of want of advertisement on their part. It has been admitted by all the speakers that it is a useful institution, and that it did useful work. There is also no gain-saying the fact that even if there is any mistake in its work or in its constitution, it can be set right and rectified in the constitution of the next Committee. The Committee that we have is not a permanent Committee. Therefore the only question upon which the House is to divide is this. Whether after all we are going to save anything by suspending it for one year.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Whether we are going to gain anything?

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—To that my answer is an emphatic yes. We are passing through a very serious crisis and any amount of knotty questions may crop up. There are ever so many questions that have already cropped up and ever so many other questions may crop up during the course of this year. It is too much to say that there will be absolutely no important question that will have to be referred to the Committee next year. In this connection, I shall make an alternative proposal. I would ask the Government to provide for the Committee and ask them to meet only in case there are very important matters. There can be no harm in this. As the Budget now stands, there is a surplus of more than a lakh. You want to provide only for a thousand rupees for this.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—It is Rs. 2,500.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—Only a little less than one thousand was spent this year.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—That is not establishment charges. It is including bonuses.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—The Committee can very well be asked not to distribute anything. It is not obligatory on their part to do so.

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—The bonus is the essence of the Committee.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—I don't think so, Sir. The Committee as at present constituted is only a deliberative body to whom questions of importance are referred by the Government. They meet periodically, discuss and submit reports on the same. The question of establishment does not really arise. There is no separate establishment for this. It is merely the question of the T. A. of the members. More than half the members are Government servants. Then there is only the question of the Travelling Allowance of three or four non-official members and after all what does it matter to the Government when compared to the honorary advice they get from experienced Industrialists and Economists like Mr. Balarama Ayyar and the Hon'ble Member for Adur. I am sure you are not going to lose anything. My submission therefore is that the Government should provide for the amount. They may ask the Secretary to meet only if there are urgent and important cases. After all the Heavens are not going to fall by providing a thousand rupees in the Budget."

**Mr. I. N. Menon.**—Mr. Balarama Ayyar and others are invited to give advice so that there is no urgent necessity for a committee like the Economic Development Committee. They will guarantee to carry on the work for one year. They will give you advice very well without incurring any T. A. I do not find the utter necessity for having a formal institution.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—May I know whether the Committee will continue?

**Mr. I. N. Menon.**—The work will be carried on in consultation with the members. The Committee will not continue for a year.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—Is there anybody to take the opinion of the members when the existing Committee will be suspended?

**Mr. I. N. Menon.**—There is the Department of Industries and there is the Land Revenue Department which can always ascertain the opinion of these members without the continuance of any actual machinery for the time being.

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—For that matter there are the Heads of Departments and the Members of the Legislative Council and if the analogy is stretched the whole of the citizens of the State who are capable enough to consider these questions and ascertain public opinion and they will all do it in their

own way. But that is not the thing that we want. We want concerted action. We want expert opinion, the opinion of persons who are competent to give it. Allow me, Sir, to reiterate once again my position. It is that the amount may be provided and the Committee need be asked to meet only if there are very urgent matters to be considered during the course of the year. With these few observations I wish to put this motion to the vote of the House.

*The motion was put to votes and negatived.*

### Motion No. 2.

Mr. K. Mohamed Seethi.—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 55,618 for Huzur Secretariat by Re. 1.*

Mr. President, Sir, this motion is intended to draw the attention of the Government to the great hardship caused to the debtors, especially agricultural debtors, of our State by the economic depression that is prevailing throughout the land. Sir, as would be found from the speech of the Finance Member the economic depression that enveloped this country last year still persists, and there cannot be any valid contention from the Government or from any section of the non-official public that there has come about any alleviation of the sufferings of the people who are in the grips of the economic depression. Economic depression has fallen with all its force and all its cruelty upon the agricultural population of the State and it is the agricultural section of the population that is groaning under the serious consequences thereof. That the agricultural section of the population has always been heavily indebted is a fact that is admitted on all hands and the present economic depression has, to a considerable extent, added to the very serious consequences of that indebtedness. Sir, if the existence of this hardship for the agricultural population is admitted then it becomes very easy for the Government as well as for the non-official section of the House, to concede that there is a duty cast upon the Government to find out some ways and means for the alleviation of this suffering. In the course of the general discussion I had referred to this aspect of the matter, but I had no occasion to refer to one or two directions of alleviation which I have enunciated as the objects of this cut motion. I know I am laying myself to the criticisms of a section of the people that these are fantastic proposals absolutely impracticable and even undesirable in the interests of the public inasmuch as they constitute an infringement of the sacred rights of private contracts and yet I have the consolation that all these criticisms now offered were freely advanced about this time last year when we demanded for the constitution of a committee to

enquire into the question of the suspension of the kuries in the State. As we all know they turned out to be absolutely futile when Government seriously thought about this question and at last decided to constitute a committee. A committee was accordingly constituted. It visited different centres in the State, went into the question referred to it in detail and submitted a report which the Government had the kindness to characterise as a very valuable report produced in a very short time. The suggestions of the committee are under the consideration of the Government and the public are eagerly awaiting the orders. I am referring to these facts simply to controvert the suggestion that these are matters absolutely tabooed as far as the Government are concerned and beyond the pale of practical politics. It was the kindness evinced by the Government which emboldens me to come before this House and plead for the suffering agricultural population of the State.

Sir, during a period of economic depression like this the proverbial money lender is the greatest source of trouble to the people. The money lender has no caste or creed or community nor heart as the Hon'ble Member for Cheruvirutti says. Mammon is an absolute cosmopolitan. He does not disdain to have his incarnation in the Brahmin community, or the Muslim community, or the Christian community or for the matter of that any human community. The various incarnations of Mammon and the modern editions of Shylock are giving absolutely no quarter to the suffering agricultural debtors of the country. That is a fact which stares us in the face and which cannot be gainsaid. The question is what is the relief to be given to these people. Our courts of law are places where these suffering people can expect some relief, but it is my painful duty to submit to this House that for one reason or other they do not get even a fraction of the relief which they legitimately expect from our courts. I do not say for a moment that Government have to protect evading debtors who want to evade payment to creditors even though they can command money. But if bonafide debtors who cannot command money and who, if they are given sufficient time to pay their creditors would do so most gladly, are not given some protection by the State, to whom are they to go for that protection? In these matters the State has to intervene. When people groan under the sufferings created by such situations and when the State does not go to their rescue feelings are bound to show violent outbursts. We know as a matter of contemporary history that such outbursts have revolutionised the very systems of Government in other countries. Such developments may not be visible in our State just now, but we have to anticipate, and provide against them and if the State

can afford some little relief to the people by giving them some relief here and there these calamities can be averted and the gratitude of the suffering people may be earned by the State. I have suggested under this cut that in the case of debtors who are prepared to part with their properties in satisfaction of their obligations they might be enabled to do so and the creditors might be made to ask to accept payments in satisfaction of the debts by purchasing such lands at prices to be fixed by a commission. The creditors should also be induced to give reasonable concessions to debtors in the matter of granting them reasonable time for payment. I can quote instances in which debtors who could redeem their debts by the sale of two or three acres of land had to part with double that extent of their land and more for want of purchasers for the land and the unwillingness of the creditor to purchase them for reasonable prices. How the debtor is to be saved when he is in a fix like that is the question. I tried to find out a solution for it, but I honestly confess that I was not able to find out anything quite cut and dry. I would simply request this House to co-operate with me to find out some solution for the Government to act upon and my request to the Government would be that when they have their periodical meetings of Heads of Departments—and they might profitably take the advice of the Government Advocate also—they should find out some solution to this difficult question by which the sufferings of the indebted people might be alleviated on the lines that I have suggested in this House to-day. I do not press the Government for accepting the identical suggestions which I have made here. Probably they may find difficulties in adopting them in their attempt to amend the existing law by an enactment or a Proclamation or by legitimate directions to the Courts of law. They may have their own difficulties which I do not minimise. My only request is that they must seriously and earnestly think about this matter and find out some solution. I know that Courts have this discretion to afford relief to Judgment-debtors and if that discretion is exercised in its true spirit debtors will get considerable relief. I know instances in which some courts have exercised that discretion—such instances are few and far between. The rule is the refusal of these concessions. If there are exceptions they are exceptions which prove the rule. My submission is that the Government should make it not only possible, but also incumbent for the ordinary courts to give the relief that I am now seeking and I am not sure that the Civil Procedure Code is without provisions to enable the courts to do so. If a property comes up before the court for sale and if the court fixes a price

as determined by a commission and refuses to sell it below that price it will be a great relief to the debtor and the creditor gets his money or the property which will fetch that money and the debtor will be left something to fall back upon. Members of this House have received several representations from rural areas requesting them to move for some relief to agricultural indebtedness and those suggestions which I have embodied in my cut have also found a place in one or two memorials submitted to the Government as well as to the Hon'ble Members of this House. With these words, I commend this cut for the consideration of this House.

**Mr. Paul Mampilli.**—I support the motion. There is no gain-saying the fact that a large portion of our agricultural population is involved in debts, nay in very heavy debts. If statistics were to be taken of the liabilities of these men I am sure there will be an astounding revelation of their heavy indebtedness and then we will be able to realise the seriousness of the situation. As ours is an agricultural country the prosperity of our land depends mainly upon the prosperity of our agricultural population. If they are not in a prosperous condition, the revenue of our State will suffer, our commerce will suffer, and it will bring calamity to the whole State. Even at times of prosperity these agriculturists have been under the clutches of the money lenders. At this time of great economic depression, when the fruits of their labour do not bring sufficient to pay the Government tax and meet the cost of cultivation the plight of these men is indeed pitiable. They are not able to meet all the legitimate demands on their purse much less to pay the interest on their debts. And mind you they have now to pay an exorbitant rate of interest. The lowest rate at which money is available even at the best of times was not less than 12 per cent. Now at this time of economic depression the interest has gone up to 24 per cent or even to 36 per cent. Now, if we want to save the country from ruin we will have to find some solution to redeem our agriculturists from their indebtedness. A Land Mortgage Bank is of course one of the means. Our Government seem to take such a long time over the consideration of the establishment of this useful institution. Even now, there is no assurance that such a bank will be started in the near future. If I remember right, the Honourable Member for Revenue said that they have to take stock of their savings before they can decide to invest any money in the bank. We have to press upon the attention of the Government the necessity of starting such a bank next year itself. Instead of utilising the surplus at the hands of Government for harbour and railway works, let a portion of it at least be invested in the Land Mortgage Bank. I would say that such a bank is

more necessary than the harbour or railway. The harbour and the railway are for the people. If the people are ruined who are the persons to be benefited by the development of the harbour and the railway. If the Government is going to delay the starting of the bank still further the remedy will become useless, the patient having died in the meanwhile.

With regard to the latter portion of the motion there are agriculturists who are debtors to institutions under Government management like Devaswams and Palaces. In the case of such institutions at least if the debtors are unable to pay their debts, their lands may be purchased at reasonable prices in discharge of their debts. I believe the Government can make arrangements or issue commissions for valuing the properties and purchasing them at reasonable prices.

In this connection, another observation which I would like to make is that in the case of sales of land for arrears of revenue there is absolutely no proportion regarding the extent of land sold to the actual arrears of revenue due. Whatever be the amount of arrears, the whole lands upon which the arrears are due, are proclaimed for sale and sold. The arrears due might be a few rupees while the property sold might be valued at thousands of rupees. I would say that only so much of the land should be sold as would actually suffice for the arrears due. In this way some sort of amelioration can be afforded to the agricultural population who are involved in debts.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—I simply rise to say that all the statements contained in the motion are absolutely true. But I have been thinking to suggest some constructive proposal to the Government and I must confess that I have not been able to make any suggestion. When we are in such difficulties, when a question requires the subtlety of brain and some engineering skill, we generally refer the question to the Leader of the House, because he is capable of finding out some solution and therefore we will on this occasion leave it to him to consider some measures by which some amelioration may be given to these poor people. One or two suggestions given here only touch the fringe of the question. For example, under Devaswam and Amma Tampuran Palace there are only very few tenants. Certainly that is a line which must appeal to the Government.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Government can deal with them only as private parties. They should not be considered as departments of Government.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—We have got the President and the Diwan. Though they are two different names the person is the same. But in the case of a Land Mortgage Bank the diffi-

culty will be that the bank can advance money only to those who possess land. It does not concern with the lending of money to tenants who have to till the soil and who depend for their livelihood upon their labour. They also require some relief. Therefore this question has to be tackled with at the very root and it is very difficult to suggest, because any suggestion that may be offered will involve interference with the rights of the other parties. That is the great difficulty. The only thing so far as I could see is to give a wider and a more generous interpretation of this question when it goes to the courts of law. I am only making a suggestion. But I think a general understanding as far as possible within reason and a wider use of the discretion of the court of law may go to a very great extent. The rest of the solution we leave it to yourself.

**Mr. Popatlal Govardhan Lalan.**—Sir, I oppose this motion. The mover of this motion may think that I am supporting the money-lender. I am not a money-lender, nor do I represent money lenders. But if this motion is carried out and if the suggestions of the Hon'ble Member for Muslims are carried out, I think that money-lenders may try their level best not to lend any money. Because if they do not get their money repaid by the parties or any relief granted by the court, I do not think that they will have any money left with them. The land of agriculturists is mortgaged when money is lent to them, and when debtors say that they have no yield, according to the debtors' views, I think it will be a little too much suffering for the money-lenders, if the law also is denied to them. Of course, money-lenders also should have a merciful eye on the debtors, and as the Muslim member said that in order to satisfy a few hundreds or thousands of rupees some big area of the property is being sold. I don't think that a creditor who owes a few hundreds or thousands of rupees which are advanced on a mortgage of a big area, would find it difficult either to get money or to sell the property mortgaged. If this motion is made into law I think the banks also will have to wind up their business. But as the Hon'ble Member for Cheruvipuruthy expressed, Devaswam Departments should open big treasuries and help in this depression time these agriculturists paying money, accepting mortgage or purchasing the properties and thus give relief to the money lenders as well as to the agriculturists, but not sympathise only with the agriculturists. So I oppose the motion, because it is sympathising only with one party and therefore I urge the Government to find out some solution to help both the parties.

മിസ്റ്റർ. കെ. എം. ഇബ്രാഹിം.--ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തോടു് വളരെ ശക്തിപൂർവ്വമായി യോജിക്കുന്നു. രാജകാര്യങ്ങളിൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് സ്പെൻഡിംഗ് കാര്യങ്ങളൊന്നും വേറെ, പ്രൈവറ്റ് കാര്യങ്ങളൊന്നും വേറെയായി വിചാരിക്കുന്ന ആ ഘട്ടം ഇപ്പോൾ തീരെ മാറിയിരിക്കുന്നുവെന്നാണ് എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നത്. സർക്കാർ എപ്പോഴും പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടെ ഗുണത്തിനുവേണ്ടിയാണ് ജോലി ചെയ്യുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നത്. അങ്ങനെയൊരിക്കലും വ്യക്തിപരമായ ചില വ്യാപാരങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പങ്കെടുത്തുകൂടാ എന്നു പറയുന്നതിൽ അർത്ഥമുണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. വ്യക്തിപരമായുള്ള വ്യാപാരങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പങ്കെടുത്തുകൊണ്ടാണ് എല്ലാകാലവും സ്ഥിതി ചെയ്യവരുന്നത്. അങ്ങനെയുള്ള പങ്കുകൊണ്ട് പ്രജകൾക്ക് സന്തോഷവും സുഖവും കൂടുതൽ ഉണ്ടാക്കുവാനാണ് സർക്കാരിന്റെ നയം ബാങ്കുകളോടും വ്യാപാരങ്ങളോടും ബന്ധിച്ചിരിക്കേണ്ടത്. അതുകൊണ്ട് പ്രൈവറ്റ് കൺട്രാക്റ്റിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം സർക്കാരിന്റേതും ചെയ്യാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലെന്നുള്ളതിന്റെ യുക്തിശാസ്ത്രപരമായ കറിച്ചു് എനിക്കു വലിയ അത്ഭുതമാണു തോന്നുന്നത്. ഗവണ്മെന്റു പറയുന്ന ആ പദാർത്ഥത്തിനു വിപരീതമായിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു സങ്കല്പമാണിതെന്നാണ് എനിക്കു തോന്നിയിട്ടുള്ളത്. സാധുക്കളായ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ സങ്കടങ്ങളെ കുറിച്ച് എന്നെപ്പോലെ തന്നെ പല നിയോജക മണ്ഡലങ്ങളേയും പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കുന്ന മെമ്പർമാർ അടിയ്ക്കടി ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ ഉൽബോധിപ്പിച്ചു വന്നിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് ഭിവാൻജി അവർകൾക്കു കിട്ടിയിട്ടുള്ള കത്തുകൾതന്നെ എടുത്തു നോക്കിയാൽ ആ കത്തുകൾ മൂലം ജനങ്ങളുടെ ഇടയിലുള്ള അസ്വസ്ഥത ഏതു വിധത്തിലാണെന്നു മനസ്സിലാകും. എന്നാൽ വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഇക്കാര്യത്തിൽ പല കലാപങ്ങളും ഈ അടുത്തകാലത്തുതന്നെ ഉണ്ടായേയ്ക്കുമോ എന്നും എനിക്കു സംശയമുണ്ട്. കൊടുങ്ങല്ലൂരിനടുത്തു് ഈയിടെ ഒരു വലിയ ധനവാൻ ഒരു ചെറിയ സംഖ്യയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി സാധുക്കളുടെ വസ്തു വിലുവാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുകയും, ആളെ തന്നെ ഇപ്പോൾ കാണാതാകയും ചെയ്തിരിക്കുന്നുവത്രെ അയാൾ തിരിച്ചു വരുമായിരിക്കാം. കലാപങ്ങൾക്കു ടിടവരാതെ ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽനിന്നു് എന്തെങ്കിലും അതയാവശ്യമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾ ചെയ്ത് കൃഷിക്കാരെ സഹായിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. എന്റെ നിയോജക മണ്ഡലത്തിൽതന്നെ അടുത്തകാലത്തുണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള പട്ടഭാരന്മാരുടെ കറവു് എത്രയും ഭീമമായിരിക്കുന്നു. ഞങ്ങൾ കുട്ടികളായിരുന്ന കാലത്തു് ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നതിൽ പകുതിയേ പട്ടഭാരന്മാർ ഇപ്പോഴുള്ളൂ. റവന്യൂ മെമ്പർ ഇതിനെ സാക്ഷീകരിക്കുമല്ലോ, ഇതാണ് സ്റ്റേറ്റിന്റെ പല ഭാഗത്തും കാണുന്ന ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ സ്ഥിതി. വോട്ടേഴ്സ് ലിസ്റ്റിൽ എണ്ണം വർദ്ധിക്കുന്ന ചില

ജാലങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഇടയിടെ നടത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിലും വാസ്തവത്തിൽ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ സ്ഥിതി ക്രമേണ ക്ഷയിച്ചാണ് വരുന്നതെന്നുള്ള സംഗതി ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പ്രത്യേകം ശ്രദ്ധയോടെ നോക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. ഇൻഡ്യയിൽ പല സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും പല ശ്രമങ്ങളും ചെയ്ത് കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ സങ്കടനിവാരണം വരുത്തിത്തന്നതായി നാം പത്രങ്ങളിൽ കാണുന്നുണ്ട്. സത്യഗ്രഹവും മറ്റും തുടങ്ങിയിട്ടുള്ളതന്നെ അവർ വേണ്ടിയാണ്. അടുത്തതന്നെ ഭവനഗതി കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ക്ഷോഭമുണ്ടാകുമെന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കി ഗവണ്മെന്റുതന്നെ, ന്യായമായി കൃഷിക്കാർ തീർക്കേണ്ടതായ കടങ്ങളെ കൊടുത്തു തീർക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. ഈ സംഖ്യ പ്രജകൾ മാസംതോറും നികുതിപോലെ അടച്ചുതീർത്താൽ മതിയെന്നു നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്നതോന്നു. സിലോണിലും മറ്റും ആളുകൾക്ക് ഈ മാതിരി സഹായങ്ങൾ ഇന്നും ചെയ്തുവരുന്നുണ്ട്. അതുപോലെ ഇവിടെയും കഴിവുള്ള വിധത്തിൽ ആലോചിച്ചു ചെയ്യണം. ഈ സംഗതി ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഭയാദൃഷ്ടിയിൽ പതിയേണമെന്ന് ഞാൻ ഒന്നുകൂടി അർത്ഥിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു വരമിരിക്കുന്നു.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—The mover of the motion by adopting a very reasonable attitude has saved me from a very embarrassing situation. I should thank him for that. It will be cruel to deny the appalling poverty of India. At the same time I cannot without mature consideration on the part of the Government definitely say yes or no to any of the proposals that the member has suggested. He himself admitted that he is not in a position to suggest constructive proposals. He asked us therefore to consider the matter in detail to put it as one of the items for the heads of Departments' conference and try to see what could be done. That the Government shall do.

*The motion was with leave withdrawn.*

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—With your leave, Sir, Cranganur budget is not here on the agenda paper. I do not know when we shall be able to say anything about General Administration in Cranganur. We should be given an opportunity for that.

**President.**—Can we not discuss it along with the cut motions?

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—No cut motion for General Administration in Cranganur.

**President.**—The discussion on the Cranganur budget will be taken up at half-past four.

### Motion No. 3.

**Mr. M. A. Chakko.**—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 55,618 for General Administration by Re. 1.

I have been induced to table the cut motion after perusing the answer to question No. 541 answered on the 5th of Kum-

bham 1107 and published on page 890 and Appendix 12, page 929 of the official report. I had sent in a further interpellation in the matter and I was awaiting the Government reply on it. In the absence of that reply, the question having not come up for answer in the Council I regret that I am unable to formally move this motion now. So I must forego the present opportunity of moving it.

*The motion was therefore considered withdrawn.*

#### Motion No. 4.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—Sir, I move to reduce the allotment of Rs. 55,618 for General Administration by Re. 1. My object in moving this cut is to urge upon the Government the necessity of making Government servants occupying Sirkar buildings pay rent calculated at 10 per cent of their salary, subject, however, to a maximum of Rs. 75 per mensem. I do not think any long speech is necessary in support of this motion, since the justice of the contention is obvious. If the privilege of occupying Sirkar buildings were given to all the Government servants without any distinction, we might have looked upon it as a part of the pay and other emoluments of public service. In that way there would not have been any objection to such a system; of course, the pay will have to be correspondingly reduced. Now what we see is this: a few Government servants occupy Sirkar buildings free of rent, while other Government servants have to hire their quarters. This, I suppose, is an iniquitous system, which at the same time involves a waste of money, that might have otherwise accrued to the Sirkar. And especially when such a thing happens in the case of high-paid servants of the Government there is absolutely no justification whatever for such concession. Again, when we consider the economic depression of these days as also the fact that high-paid Government servants are not at all affected by the depression, there is still one more argument in support of the request that I have made. I do not want to enter into the details, or to show who are the Government servants occupying Sirkar buildings free of rent. I simply enunciate the simple principle that the Government should get rent for their buildings, calculated at 1/10 of the pay of the officers occupying them—which I submit is a very moderate proposal. In the ordinary cases, professional men and people, living in towns, have to pay rent for their houses at rates much more than 1/10 of their salary or other income. So the 1/10 demanded from Government servants is I think not a heavy demand. We have the precedent in British India, where Government servants are required to pay rent calculated at 1/10 of their pay. In the motion before the House, however, I have

included a provision in favour of the Government servants here. Ordinarily, they would be required to pay only 1/10 of their salary; but when it comes to big amounts, I have provided for a maximum limit of Rs. 75 per mensem. Otherwise, a Government servant, who get Rs. 1,000 per month, will have to pay Rs. 100 a month as house rent. I have made this limitation, because I realise that, after all, the Government servants here, even the Departmental Heads, would not require houses, the rent of which would be more than Rs. 75. Moreover, I think houses of higher rates may not even be available in the principal towns of the Cochin State.

Briefly then, I wish to say once again that there is no necessity for a very long speech, since the justice of my contention is obvious. Therefore, I commend the motion to the acceptance of this House.

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—I beg to second this motion.

**Dr. A. G. Menon.**—The Government Members may be asked to express their opinion before other Members are asked to speak on the subject. They may also be given a second chance to reply.

**President.**—That will duplicate matters. Even now, as it stands, we will not have time enough to go through the whole agenda.

**Dr. A. G. Menon.**—But, Sir, if the Government accepts the motion there will be no necessity of a speech at all.

**President.**—Yes, all right.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I have no objection to comply with the wish of the House. First and foremost we have no regular system at all of supplying quarters to officers. We may have stray houses here and there throughout the State which a few lower grade officers may be occupying. There is a provision to cover such instances in the D. P. W. Code which fixes the percentage according to the salary of the officers. The rent for the house, it also lays down should on no account be anything less than the amount which would be required to cover 3½ per cent interest on the capital. In the case of these lower grade officers we have been following the rule on these lines. For example in Irinjalakkuda we have the Pandaravaka Madhom which is occupied by the District Munsiff and there he is paying a rent of Rs. 9—8—0 a month. Then one building acquired from somebody in Cranganur is occupied by the Overseer and there he is paying a rent of Rs. 4. Similarly in Cochin one building is occupied by the Inspector of Excise and another by the Water works clerk and again another by the Work Superintendent at Kolinjampara.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Will you please give the rent that is paid by them?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Rs. 5 is paid by the Excise Inspector; Rs. 2 by the clerk and Re. 1 by the Work Superintendent. So this is how the situation stands in Cochin. There is not a general system of supplying houses to officers on rent. There is no such system. So there is no necessity for this rule.

**Mr. A. Sankara Menon.**—Are there officers keeping houses without paying rent?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—There is the instance of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer. He is given free quarters and it has been a part of his emoluments for a very long time. Every Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer has been receiving free quarters without rent. The same concession has been extended to the present occupant also.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Is it part of his emoluments?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Yes, his predecessors have been getting it as such and so it must be the same in his case also.

**Mr. George Chakyamuri.**—Sir, I wish to support the motion and in doing so I must say that I am not satisfied with the reasons given by the Hon'ble the Secretary Member. We are not concerned with the instances given by the Hon'ble the Secretary. The resolution before the House is that persons who occupy Government buildings must pay rent for them in the proportion of 1/10 of their salary. I respectfully beg to think that there is absolutely no justification for giving the building to the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer free of rent. I request that I shall not be misunderstood; I have nothing personal against that officer; I shall be pleased if greater favours are done to him. But the point is where is the justification for making such an invidious distinction? The argument of the Hon'ble the Secretary that it is to be considered as a part of his emolument, I respectfully submit, is fallacious. Dr. Combes was a European officer and he put the Government on terms before he accepted his job and it was only proper that he was given a building under such circumstances. If Dr. Verghese was also given a building free it was only a mistake and there is no justification in continuing that mistake. Considering the cost of the site and the House, I am sure it will come to 65 or 70 thousand rupees. Why should the Government lose the interest on such a big investment? Why should they favour a single Head of Department in this fashion? There are other Heads of Departments who would be delighted to go there—such a fine building—a building which is better than the Diwan's quarters. I respectfully beg to submit that this invidious distinction should

be removed soon. If the Government insist on retaining the present man in the building let him at least pay the rent. The request of this House, I must say, is a very modest one. The question does not relate to the quarters of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer only. If there are other public servants occupying Government building they must also be made to pay. There is a building attached to almost every hospital in the State. The doctors are living there free of rent. Doctors are people who get additional income by way of private practice. In fact they are normally better than all other officers in the State. I submit that it is high time that either the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer should pay rent for the house or hand the same over to the Government. So many distinguished guests come here and I know they are very often put to great difficulties for want of proper accommodation in the T. B. Why can't the Government take up this building and conduct a first class T. B. there? (*Hear, hear*). Twice or thrice—I know—at one time when the States' Committee visited and at another time when His Excellency the Governor of Madras came, the Ernakulam T. B. had to be Commandered by the Government, because they could not find decent buildings for these people to live in.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—Sir, the matter is not one of practice. It is one of principle. Whether officer A or officer B occupies building X or building Y, we are not concerned with. We want to see a uniform practice adopted in regard to every officer in the State. There is no complaint that Heads of Departments in the State are ill-paid. We are now in days of depression. The pay of the Heads of Departments, considered along with the finances of the State, the work they have to turn out, the extent of the area in which the work has to be turned out and the comparative cheapness of living, must strike any one as amply sufficient. In regard to the subordinates also we had a revision only recently. There is therefore no justification at present for giving free quarters to any officer in the State, even if he be a medical man.

I can understand the case of police men living in lines. They are compelled to be there. They are forced to live a semi-military life. They have always to remain there and be in readiness to answer the call to duty whenever made. The case of medical men are different; besides their pay they get a very large amount by outside practice? So also in the case of officers drawing very high salaries and occupying Government buildings. The practice arose in days of plenty. But now we have to look about for new sources of revenue. Why did you allow one officer of the Government drawing a very fact salary to occupy a building which has been valued by the Government at

Rs. 65,000; and that, when you stood in need of buildings for your offices at Ernakulam and who the officer when was so allowed to occupy had, two buildings of his own in Ernakulam which he subsequently seems to have sold. There is no justification whatsoever in giving quarters to officers unless there is absolute necessity for that. Of course, it is desirable to avoid reference to particular instances. But in the case of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer that cannot be avoided. His quarters are over a mile away from the hospital. Within the hospital premises are a few doctors provided with quarters so as to be available to attend to emergent cases. At the time the building was put at the disposal of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer he was not in charge of the hospital. Subsequently after his two buildings in Ernakulam were sold he has taken charge of a portion of this hospital though he himself is a touring officer. We on this side of the House believe that there is absolutely no justification for giving quarters to our officers if you do not charge them—let the charge be anything. The Government must get something in return.

I am sorry that the motion regarding the Economic Development Committee came up before this. The Secretary to the Government has stated that the annual rent is generally fixed  $3\frac{1}{2}\%$  on the cost of the building. If that be the case, the rent on the building occupied by the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer comes to about Rs. 190 a month. That is very nearly Rs. 2,400 a year. We were told that only a sum of Rs. 2,500 would be required for the Economic Development Committee. Now this rent would have satisfied the needs of the Economic Development Committee. Why should you allow an officer to occupy a building of Rs. 65,000 starving at the same time a very useful Committee as admitted by the Government.

**Mr. M. Krishna Menon.**—I rise to support this motion. The Government I understand had to rent a house on a monthly rent of Rs. 70 for the purpose of housing the members of the Legislative Council. So I do not understand why the Government allowed this particular officer to occupy a Sirkar building without any rent in the absence of any agreement. Simply because his predecessor in office was living there, the successor is not entitled to occupy the building without rent. Further day-before-yesterday in the course of a discussion we heard that a certain Rao came from Erode and got confirmation in the grade of 70—80 when there was a Cochinite already in service in the same grade in the same department. When all these outsiders take away all the money from the State, let them at least pay some amount as house-rent. Why should there be this invidious distinction, especially in the case of outsiders?

A highly paid officer is not paying a single pie rent while the Sirkar collects rent from his low-paid subordinates. So I wholeheartedly support this motion.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Sir, I just want to tell the Hon'ble Secretary that the idea of the granting of free quarters as a part of the emoluments of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer is wrong. We must consider how this came into existence. It came into existence, because in olden times many Heads of Departments were Europeans or officers from British service coming here for 4 or 5 years. It was then the custom of the Government to give them decent houses to live in, because they did not belong to this place. There was a place for Mr. Browning at Trichur which is at present the Office of the Director of Public Instruction. There was another place which was the Conservator's office later on and which was subsequently occupied by Mr. Chettiar of glorious fame. Mr. Davies had a building at Ernakulam which I believe is the present Comptroller's Office. Similarly Dr. Combes was connected with this place which is now occupied by the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer. Now the whole of Cochin State knows that what was applicable to other officers was not applicable to the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer in olden times; and it is a fact which I have taken the trouble to explain to this House and to hammer out to the Heads of the Government to enlighten them that invidious distinction was shown in the case of one officer into whose confidence some distinguished people had fallen. Naturally this was the genesis of the arrangement and I remember that my Hon'ble friend came into this House and told us that his position was unlike. When any man makes use of Government property he must pay for it, unless it is stated that it is part of his monthly emoluments. The Government must prove that it is his emolument; otherwise the officer is bound to pay. This House will remember that when two years ago when Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar was the Excise Commissioner and was occupying a single room—it was a single room and not a whole building—and his family was not staying with him; they were at Trichur—this Council raised its voice of protest against living there without paying and the Government directed that he should pay. I think it was Rs. 10. A similar order was passed directing the Commissioner to pay a sum for occupying a couple of rooms in his office. He was also paying some amount, I do not exactly remember the amount. The fact remains that the contention of the Council is right and just, that those who enjoy the Government property must pay for it. It is doubly necessary in the case of the present Chief Medical and

Sanitary Officer who receives a rent from the Government for his building, which is being used now as the Office of the Inspector of Schools (*Hear, hear*). When another man is enjoying your property you must get the fee for it. Then why not extend the same principle in this case; why not extend the same generosity to the Government which has been so very generous to you?

**Mr. George Chakymuri.**—Where is that place—in Trichur?

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Yes. It is used as the Office of the Inspector of Schools. The Director of Public Instruction will correct me if I am wrong. There will be no scarcity for a decent place for an officer who has been here for the last 25 or 30 years and it is high time that this place must be made use of as a public place for various purposes. My friend stated that you have rented a house. It has a very high rent. But the house deserves that rent. Indeed it fetches that rent. But considering the utility which you are going to have for the sake of one or two members—I think many are not there—the rent that we pay is high. Then why not you take over this house and make it a second class guest house for the members? We only want a second class building; and also for other guests who are not in a position to occupy bigger places this may be used. Why not we be given this place? It is very near the Railway Station. It is a central place and it is a very important locality and we are not likely to have a better site than that. In these circumstances I think the Government must consider, and it is not a small thing and Government should not give room for this sort of hostile criticism in this House.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I do not want to add anything more. His predecessors were getting these quarters and we thought that it should be extended to him also.

**Dr. A. G. Menon.**—Is there any agreement?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—There is no written agreement, but that has been the practice.

**Dr. A. G. Menon.**—Is there any verbal agreement?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—But there is the practice.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—Is there not limitation?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—The question has to be referred to the Government Advocate.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—Sir, I would not have thought of a reply seeing that my contention has been supported so vigorously with facts and figures by the Hon'ble Members of this House, but for the very short reply that was given by the Secretary. (*Hear, hear*).

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I gave a short reply because the question finally centred upon this particular topic.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—I am not complaining of the shortness of the reply ; I am complaining of its untenableness. The Secretary contends that the house given to the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer is part of the emoluments of his office. But the Hon'ble Members on this side of the House have showed conclusively that this House should not be considered as part of the emoluments of the Office of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer ; and in doing so, they have traced the question to its very genesis, and showed clearly how the practice came about, of giving free quarters to the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer. There were in the past many European officers in the Cochin service and it was the practice in those days to give them free quarters. In that way, the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer, too who happened to be a European, was given free quarters. Now, in the case of other officers, when Europeans were succeeded by the sons of the soil, this privilege was not extended to them, because there was no necessity to give them such a privilege; and by applying the same argument to the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer, when that officer happened to be a son of the soil he, too, should not have been granted the privilege of free quarters. If it were a portion of the emoluments of the office that argument ought to have held good in the case of the others also. Mr. Davis was getting free quarters; but his successor Mr. Mathai was not given that privilege. The cases of Messrs. Brown and Browning and their Indian successors are also instances to the point. If free quarters were a part of the emoluments of the office of these European gentlemen, then the privilege ought to have been continued in the case of their successors too.

I am therefore simply surprised to see that the Secretary could bring forward an argument which has been completely exploded by the Hon'ble Members on this side of the House. I presume it is only because he had no other plausible argument to fall back upon, that he once again brought forward this argument which was already shown to be completely untenable. With these few words, I press the motion to the acceptance of the House.

**Dr. D. Raghavendra Rao.**—Sir, may I offer a word of personal explanation? Having heard all these remarks I wish to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members that I got this free quarters as a mamool just like all my predecessors had the same place. Now that this question has been brought before this House, I am very glad to say that I am prepared to give any reasonable rent fixed by the Government (*Hear, hear*).

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—But nevertheless I press the motion, because it applies not only to the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer, but it is a general motion.

*Motion put and carried.*

*The House rose for lunch at 2 p. m. and met again at 3 p. m. with the Deputy President in the Chair.*

#### Motion No. 5.

*As the following motion was not moved it was considered withdrawn.*

**Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.**—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,279 for Legislative Council—Establishment by Re. 1.*

*(To bring to the notice of the Government the desirability of including in the agenda the issue proposed to be raised by the Members in their cut motions).*

#### Motion No. 6.

**Mr. P. Raman Menon.**—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.*

Sir, I have tabled this cut motion to impress upon the Government the urgent necessity for the appointment of a committee to go into the question of retrenchment and reductions of expenditure possible in the various departments in the State.

**Deputy President.**—I have to say a few words. The Cranganur Budget may be taken half an hour before the time. Since there are no cut motions I do not know whether you like to take it half an hour before.

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—I think it would properly come before the Legislative Council after the General Administration of the State.

**Deputy President.**—General Administration goes as a whole; either you can discuss the Cranganur Budget half an hour before the State Budget or half an hour after.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Cranganur Budget has to be taken after this allotment. If there is any point on which a vote has to be recorded by the House we cannot do it while we are on the discussion of the present budget.

**Deputy President.**—What time do you require for Cranganur?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—10 or 15 minutes, Sir.

**Deputy President.**—In the Progressive party there will be only two or three speakers. They will be allowed a little more time. The rest will have 5 minutes each.

**Mr. George Chakyamuri.**—I do not know whether it will be fair. Because we do not belong to the party we will be given only less time.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—As we have selected only one or two speakers they will be given a little more time. No importance is given to the person.

**Deputy President.**—Only one or two will speak on that side. I must give some concession to them.

**Mr. P. Raman Menon.**—Now, from the budget presented to this House we find that many works of great public utility have been omitted in the next year's Budget. Even works which are half finished are not included for lack of funds. Of course it is admitted on all hands that this is a time of great depression and that the Government find it difficult to find funds to carry on the administration even. I think I can make out successfully that there is a lot of waste involved in the administration of the various departments concerned and if without going into them thoroughly we hap-hazardly effect cuts in the various departments, it can only create a very unsatisfactory state of things. The above course of appointing a committee to investigate and report has been followed in our sister State also. We find there a committee appointed to report upon the possibility of retrenchment and reductions in expenditure in the various departments. We find similar committees appointed in British India and they have suggested means of effecting retrenchment. Our Government was attempting to reduce expenditure unaided by means of cuts in the various departments. I do not know if it has done so, after thoroughly examining the condition in the various departments. For example, I find the Registration Department is attempting to cut down their expenditure by the abolition of three or four Registry Offices. Whether that is absolutely necessary is a question that can be determined only after examining the expenditure in the various other departments in the State and after satisfying that there is no waste in any of those Departments. Now, for example the Mulanthuruthi Registry Office is going to be abolished. Mulanthuruthi Registry Office serves a number of villages situated far away from Trippunithura, such as Amballur, Keecheri, and other places, and all these people will have to come to Trippunithura, to register their documents. You may consider the hardship involved in such a state of things when you find that there are no good roads and there are no easy means of communication with reference to some of these villages. They have to walk in some cases eight or ten miles. These are not the only reasons that prompted me to send in this cut motion. You might ask me why should we appoint a fresh committee now when there is already the report of the Special Finance Committee. The Special Finance Committee was appointed

ed at a time when the prices of commodities were very very high and the officers were complaining that they could not get on with what they were getting at that time. Conditions have changed vastly since then. Now the value of money has increased and to-day we see they occupy a much better position with respect to the purchasing power of money; moreover, even the Special Finance Committee's Report has not been followed as a whole by the Government. The Government has, of course, wherever they wanted adopted the report and they have simply brushed it aside when it suited them. Therefore, I think in the interest of fair play also, so far as the service is concerned, a reconsideration of the position now, is highly necessary. I think this Council had been complaining from the very beginning that our services are top-heavy and that it ought to be modified according to the conditions obtaining to-day. With these remarks I would submit this motion for the acceptance of the House.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—It does not appear that there is much of a necessity to appoint a committee to go into this question. We have gone into it at the time of the preparation of the Budget and, as I explained this morning, all possible sources of retrenchment had been exhaustively touched. I do not think any more use will be served by appointing a committee to look into this affair.

**Mr. P. Raman Menon.**—I do not press the motion.

*The motion was withdrawn with leave of the House.*

#### Motion No. 7.

**Mr. K. Ayyappan.**—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re 1.*

സാർ, കാസ്റ്റ് വാർ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മെന്റിനെ പറ്റി ഞാൻ ചോദിച്ച ചോദ്യത്തിന് മറുപടിയായി ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പറഞ്ഞത് ആ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മെന്റ് അവർ റവ്യ ചെയ്യാറില്ലെന്നാണ്. ഈ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മെന്റ്; മാത്രമല്ല സാധാരണ ക്വാട്ടർലി സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മെന്റ് റവ്യ ചെയ്യേണ്ട ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്ന് ആ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മെന്റ് സ് വേണമെന്നുള്ള സ്റ്റേബിൾ ആർഡാൽ തന്നെ പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇത് ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഗസറ്റിൽ പരസ്യം ചെയ്യണമെന്ന് ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടതിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം ആരെങ്കിലും കമ്മ്യൂണൽ പാഷ്വാലിറി നിയമന വിഷയത്തിൽ കാണിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ എന്നറിയുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഈ നില ശരിയാണെന്ന് എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഞാൻ കററ ഫിനാൻസ് ഇവിടെ വായിക്കാം. ഞാൻ ഇതു വായിച്ചപ്പോൾ എന്റെ വർഗ്ഗക്കാർക്കുവേണ്ടി മാത്രമല്ല ആക്ഷേപം കയ്യടക്കാൻ തെറ്റിയിരിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു. നിയമിക്കുന്ന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ ഉദ്ദേശം ചീത്തയായിട്ടുള്ള ഉദ്യോഗ നിയമന വിഷയത്തിൽ ഈ വിധം തെറ്റുകൾ സംഭവിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. അറിയാവുന്നവരും, പരിചയക്കാരും, ഇഷ്ടമുള്ളവരും ആവശ്യപ്പെടുമ്പോൾ ഏതു സമുദായത്തിൽ പെട്ട

ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനായിരുന്നാലും ചിലപ്പോൾ എല്ലാം നിയമനങ്ങളിൽ ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള പക്ഷപാതങ്ങൾ കാണിച്ചേയ്ക്കും. അത് ആ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഒരു പ്രത്യേക സമുദായങ്ങളിൽ പെട്ടതുകൊണ്ടല്ല. ആദ്യമായി റവന്യൂ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റ് എടുക്കാം. പേഷ്കാർവർകൾ നടത്തിയിട്ടുള്ള നിയമനങ്ങളിൽ അധികം ബ്രാഹ്മണരെ വച്ചിട്ടില്ലാത്തതിൽ ഞാൻ അദ്ദേഹത്തെ അഭിനന്ദിയ്ക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ തഹസീൽദാർമാർ നടത്തിയിട്ടുള്ള റവന്യൂ നിയമനങ്ങളിൽ ൧൨ -ം നായന്മാരാണ്. വേറെ ഒരു ലിസ്റ്റിൽ—റവന്യൂ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽതന്നെ തഹസീൽദാർമാർ നടത്തിയിട്ടുള്ള ൩൦ നിയമനങ്ങളിൽ ൨൪ -ം നായന്മാരാണ്. ഈ നിയമനങ്ങളൊന്നും വലിയ ക്വാളിഫിക്കേഷൻ ആവശ്യമുള്ളവയല്ല. എഫിഷ്യൻസി എന്ന കാരണം പറയുവാനും സാധിയ്ക്കുന്നതല്ല.

പിന്നെ പബ്ലിക് വർക്ക് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽ ൧൨ നിയമനങ്ങളിൽ ൭ -ം നായന്മാർ. ബാക്കി ൫ എണ്ണമാണ് മറ്റുള്ളവ ക്ലൈംകൂടി വീതിക്കാനുള്ളത്.

പിന്നെ സ്കൂൾ ഇൻസ്പെക്ടർ നടത്തിയത് ഒരു നിയമനമേയുള്ളൂ. അത് ബ്രാഹ്മണനാണ്.—സഭേന്ദ്യൻ ഡിവിഷനാണെന്നു തോന്നുന്നു.

ഫാറസ്സിൽ ൧൫ -ൽ ൮ -ം നായന്മാരാണ്. ചീഫ് കോർട്ടിൽ—അവധിയാണെല്ലോ നീതിയും ന്യായവും അധികം പരിചരിക്കേണ്ടത്—൭ നിയമനങ്ങളുള്ളതിൽ ൩ ബ്രാഹ്മണർ, പിന്നെ ൪ എണ്ണമേ പങ്കുവയ്ക്കുവാനുള്ളൂ. അഗ്രികൾച്ചർ ആൻഡ് വെറ്ററിനറി ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽ ൧൦ -ൽ ൭ -ം നായന്മാർ. ഇൻറസ്റ്റിംഗിസ്റ്റ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽ ൧൩ -ൽ ൫ -ം നായന്മാർ. ഇതുവളരെ അധികമല്ല! നായന്മാരുടെ കണക്കുമാത്രം പറഞ്ഞാൽ മറ്റു ലിസ്റ്റുകളിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ഇല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള നിയമനങ്ങൾ റവന്യൂ ചെയ്യേണ്ട ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നു തവമ്മെന്റിന് തോന്നുന്നില്ലെന്നു പറയുന്നത് ശരിയല്ല. ഇന്നലെ ഈ ഫോറസിലെ ലീഡർ, ഗവണ്ണർ സാർവിന്റെ ഒരു പ്രസംഗത്തിൽനിന്ന് ഒരു ഭാഗം ഉദ്ധരിച്ച് ഇവിടെ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അത് ഗവണ്ണർ എന്തർമിറ്റിൽ പറഞ്ഞുവെന്നുള്ള കാര്യംതന്നെ വളരെ സംശയമാണ്. ഗവണ്ണർ പറഞ്ഞതിനെ ഉദ്ധരിച്ച് ഇവിടെ ഈ വക വാദങ്ങൾ നടത്തുന്നവർക്കു എതിരായി തിരിച്ചറിയുന്നത് ശരിയായില്ല. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ആരാണ് ഈ കമ്മ്യൂണിസിത്തിന് ഉത്തരവാദികൾ. മുൻപറഞ്ഞപോലുള്ള ഉദ്യോഗ നിയമനങ്ങൾ നടത്തുന്നവരോ? അല്ല; എല്ലാവർക്കും പ്രാതിനിധ്യം വേണമെന്നു വാദിയ്ക്കുന്ന ഞങ്ങളേ പോലെ ഉള്ളവരോ? ഭരണം ശരിയായി എഫിഷ്യൻഡ് ആകണമെങ്കിൽ കഴിയുന്നതും എല്ലാ

സമുദായങ്ങളിലും പെട്ട ആളുകൾ അതിലുണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതെന്നു വാദിക്കുന്നവരോ; അതു വകവെക്കാനേയും, സ്റ്റാണ്ടിംഗ് ഓർഡറുടെ അർത്ഥം ശരിയായി മനസ്സിലാക്കാനേയും അതിന് വിപരീതമായി പ്രവൃത്തിച്ച് സമുദായങ്ങൾ തമ്മിൽ തല്ലിച്ചു വഴക്കുണ്ടാക്കുന്നവരോ ആരാണ് ഈ കമ്മ്യൂണലിസത്തിനുത്തരവാദികൾ? ഒരിയ്ക്കൽ നിയമനങ്ങൾ കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ ആ നിയമനങ്ങൾ കിട്ടിയവക്ക് റൂളിംഗ് കൊടുത്തേയ്ക്കു സ്ഥിരമായല്ലോ എന്ന് ചില നിയമന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ വിചാരിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. കറെ ചീത്ത ഇവിടെ കേട്ടാൽ മതിയല്ലോ.

ഇന്നലെ ഇവിടെ ഒരു മെമ്പർ ഹാർബറിൽ കൊച്ചിക്കാരാരുമില്ലെങ്കിൽ അവടെ നടക്കുന്ന കാര്യങ്ങളറിയാൻ നമുക്ക് തീരെ സാധ്യമല്ലെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ട് പല കഴപ്പുകളുണ്ടാകാനിടയുണ്ടെന്നും പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അതുപോലെതന്നെ ചില ആഫീസുകളിൽ ഞങ്ങളുടെ ആളുകൾ ഇല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു വലിയ ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടുണ്ട്. ഞങ്ങൾ അയക്കുന്ന ഹർജികളും മറ്റും പല ക്ലർക്കുമാരുടെയും കയ്യിൽ കൂടി ഓബ്സ്കൂർക്കിംഗിന് നടുത്തിയശേഷമേ ദിവാൻറെയും മറ്റും അടുത്തു എത്തുകയുള്ളൂ. ആ റേസിൽ അധികമെണ്ണം ഇടയ്ക്കുവീഴ്വാനാണിടയുള്ളതു്.

ഇനിക്കു പുതിയ നിയമനങ്ങൾ അടുത്തു ഉണ്ടാകാൻ പോകുന്നുണ്ട്. പുതുതായി തുറക്കുന്ന സാനിറ്ററി ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിലും, കനാൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിലും, ഇൻകംടാക്സ് വകുപ്പിലും പലപുതിയ നിയമനങ്ങളും നടത്തേണ്ടതായിട്ടുവരും. അപ്പോൾ എങ്കിലും ആക്ടിംഗുകാരുടെകാലും പറഞ്ഞു ഞങ്ങളെ തോല്പിക്കരുതു്. ഈ വക കാര്യങ്ങൾ വരുമ്പോൾ അതിനുത്തരവാദിപ്പെട്ട അധികാരികൾ പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കുറഞ്ഞ അപേക്ഷകന്മാർക്ക് മുൻഗണന കൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ള നിയമനത്തെ നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തുവാൻ ശ്രമിക്കണമെന്ന് അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

രാമവർമ്മമ്പുരാൻ.—ഈ statement review ചെയ്യാറില്ലെന്നു പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം ഇതിനുപുറമെ വേറെ ഒരു statement—ഇവിടെ കിട്ടുന്നതുകൊണ്ടാണ്. അതു review ചെയ്യുമ്പോൾ ഇതു review ചെയ്യാതാവശ്യമായില്ല. അതു കാര്യത്തിനു വിപരീതമായി—

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോർജ്ജ് ചാക്രവർത്തി.—പുതിയ നിയമനങ്ങൾ നടത്തുമ്പോൾ അതിൽ അധികൃതർക്ക് മുൻഗണന കൊടുക്കണമെന്നു വല്ലപ്പോഴും ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റുകളിലേയ്ക്കു എഴുതിയയച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

രാമവർമ്മമ്പുരാൻ.—ഉണ്ട്, ഈ statement കളിൽ അയച്ചു തരുന്ന അനവധി Figures-ം മറ്റു പലകാര്യങ്ങളും കൂടി ഒന്നിച്ചു നോക്കിയപ്പോഴാണ് ഒരു ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥൻ തെറ്റുകാരനാണോ

അല്ലയോ എന്നു പറവാൻ. ഒന്നാമതു് മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞപ്പോലെ acting ക്ലർക്കുകൾക്ക് മുമ്പിൽ ഉദ്യോഗം കൊടുക്കുക എന്നൊരു condition ഉണ്ട്. അതു ചെയ്തതിന്നു് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥൻ തെറ്റുകാരനായിരിക്കുന്നതല്ല. ഓരോ സമുദായത്തിൽ നിന്നും എത്ര Applications ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു; അതിൽ എത്രപേർക്കുവേണ്ട qualifications ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു, ഇങ്ങനെ വളരെ relevant points ആലോചിക്കേണ്ടതായിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതെല്ലാം നോക്കിയിട്ട് ഇതിനെ പറ്റി ഒന്നുതന്നെ പറവാൻ തരമില്ല. ഇതിനെല്ലാം correct ആയിട്ടുള്ള മറ്റൊരു statement ഉണ്ട്. അതാണ് ഇവിടെ review ചെയ്യാറുണ്ട് എന്നു പറഞ്ഞതു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—അതു് ഏതു സ്റ്റേറ്റ്മെൻറ് ആണ്? രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—അതാണ് ഞാൻ മുമ്പിൽ പറഞ്ഞ quarterly statement of appointments. അതു നോക്കിയാലേ സകല വിവരങ്ങളും അറിയാവൂ. അങ്ങിനെ അറിഞ്ഞാലേ നിയമനങ്ങൾ നടത്തിയ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെപ്പറ്റി അന്വേഷിച്ചാൻ തരമുള്ളൂ.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—അതു Review ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—ഇതു് regular ആയിട്ടു് review ചെയ്താറുണ്ട്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—review ചെയ്തിട്ടു് അതിൽ വല്ല അസമതപങ്ങളും ഉണ്ടെന്നു് notice-ൽ വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ? ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ നിയമനം നടത്തിയ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനോടു് അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ചോദിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നിയാൽ അപ്പോളെല്ലാം അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യും.

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോജ് ചാക്യാമറ്റി.—അങ്ങിനെ ഏതെല്ലാം ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരോടു് ചോദിച്ചാൻ ഇടവന്നിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നറിഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം.

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—രണ്ടും മൂന്നും കൊല്ലത്തെ കാര്യങ്ങൾ ഒന്നുണ്ടു മിന്നിട്ടുകൊണ്ടു പറയാൻ വളരെ പ്രയാസമാണ്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോസഫ് പെട്ട.—കഴിഞ്ഞ പന്ത്രണ്ടുമാസത്തെ കിലും പറയാമോ?

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—പറയാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. പി. വള്ളോൻ.—സംരക്ഷണ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിനെപ്പറ്റി ചില ചോദ്യങ്ങളുണ്ട്. അതിനെക്കുറിച്ച്—

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—ആ കാര്യം ഇപ്പോൾ correspondence ഇരിക്കുകയാണ്.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—Sir, I support this motion. I am extremely glad to find that the present Government of Cochin are very far from the ways of Ex-Diwan Mr. Narayana Ayyar in regard to the deliberations of this Council. I remember very well Diwan Mr. Narayana Ayyar having said that as long as he was President of this Council, he would never allow this subject to be introduced here. Now we have freedom to carry on a discussion upon this subject and to point out inequalities wherever they prevail. Days were when it was considered that those who moved this question were all communalists and hence undesirables. It was thought that this was one of the worst topics that could be dealt with. But we find that the whole of India is waiting with expectant eyes for the award of the Prime Minister over the communal question. We have therefore every justification to deal here in our own humble way, with the communal problem of the State. If an easy solution can be found to this problem in any part of the world, it is the Cochin State. There is no other place, where different castes and creeds move so freely and so friendly and on such footing of equality and brotherhood as in Cochin. Under such circumstance if room is given by officers of the Government for heart-burning on the part of certain communities, that injustice must be removed. I do not want to go into this question in extenso. I was myself responsible in the first days of this Council for raking up this question and I am glad to find that as a result of persistent agitation by certain members much progress has been made. I hope that the Government Members will open their eyes and see that the space thus far covered is very little. Under this pretence and under that pretence, under the pretence of acting arrangements and under the pretence of want of applicants, the claims of people who have a right to be represented are overlooked. I plead only for justice. Do justice to the large number of communities who are still unrepresented in the public service. Just open any page of the civil list and see whether the cause for which the Hon'ble Member for South Ezhuvass pleads is not a right one. If in a just cause, the Government will not wake up and act, then when are they going to do justice.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I do not want to reply.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—എനിയ്ക്കു് ഗവണ്മെണ്ടിനോടു് ഒരു പേക്ഷ ചെയ്യാനുണ്ടു്. അതു് പ്രത്യേകിച്ചും മാനുനായ സിക്രട്ടേറിയ അമ്പർക്കളോടാണു്. സിക്രട്ടേറിയ അമ്പർക്കൾ വിചാരിച്ചാൽ ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ കമ്മ്യൂണാലിസം കുറയ്ക്കുവാൻ അദ്ദേഹം ഇവിടെ ഇരുന്നുകാലംവരെ വളരെ എടുപ്പത്തിൽ സാധിയ്ക്കും. ഈ വക

വാദങ്ങൾക്ക് തവമെങ്ങിനാ എന്തെങ്കിലും സമാധാനം പറഞ്ഞു നൽകാൻ അസാധ്യമല്ല. വിശേഷിച്ചു തവമെങ്ങു മെമ്പർമാരെ പോലെയുള്ള സമർത്ഥന്മാർക്കു ഒട്ടുംതന്നെ പ്രയാസമുണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല. ഞാൻ വായിച്ച ഫിറോസ്സിൽ പറയുന്നതുപോലുള്ള അസമതങ്ങൾ നീക്കുവാൻ തവമെങ്ങു വിചാരിച്ചാൽ പ്രയാസമില്ല. തവമെങ്ങു അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യണമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അപേക്ഷ. കാസ്റ്റ് വാർഡ്സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മെങ്ങു വരുമ്പോൾ അതിൽ പക്ഷപാതം കണ്ടാൽ തവമെങ്ങു സമാധാനം ചോദിക്കുന്നു. അങ്ങിനെ ചോദിക്കുമെന്നു വന്നാൽ നിയമന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ വലിയ അക്രമം കാണിക്കുകയല്ല. പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കുറഞ്ഞ സമുദായങ്ങൾക്കു ഈ ഉപകാരം ചെയ്യുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നു ഞാൻ സക്രട്ടറിയിോടു പ്രത്യേകിച്ചും അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

*The motion was withdrawn with leave of the House.*

#### Motion No. 8.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re 1.*

സാർ, ഈ സഭയുടെ ലീഡർ ആദ്യത്തെ ദിവസം ചെയ്ത പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ മഹാരാജാവു തിരുമനസ്സിലേയ്ക്കു മഹാരാജാവു എന്ന സ്ഥാനം കിട്ടിയതുതന്നെ യുദ്ധകാലത്തു കൊച്ചി രാജ്യം ചെയ്ത സഹായത്തിന്റെ ഫലംകൊണ്ടാണെന്നു പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. പ്രധാനമായി ഈ സഹായത്തിന്തരവാദികൾ യുദ്ധത്തിനു ഇവിടെനിന്നു പോയവരാണ്. യുദ്ധത്തിനു പോയ ആളുകൾക്കു ചില സൗജന്യങ്ങളെല്ലാം വച്ചു നീട്ടി. നാങ്ങൾ കൊല്ലാനും, ചാകാനും പോകയാണെങ്കിൽ നീക്കങ്ങൾ ഇന്നായിത്തീർന്നു കൊള്ളാം എന്നു പറഞ്ഞു. അതു കണ്ടിട്ട് ഇവർ എവിടെയോ കിടന്ന ആളുകളെ കൊല്ലാനും, സ്വയം ചാകാനും തയ്യാറായി പോയിട്ട് മടങ്ങി വന്നപ്പോൾ നീട്ടിവച്ചതെല്ലാം ഇങ്ങോട്ടു വലിച്ചുകളഞ്ഞു. അങ്ങനെ പാൻവലിച്ചത് ഒട്ടും ന്യായമല്ല. ഇനിയും എന്തെങ്കിലും ആവശ്യങ്ങൾ വരുമ്പോൾ ഇവരെ വളക്കൂട്ടിക്കൊണ്ടുവരും. അപ്പോൾ—ഇന്നല്ലെങ്കിൽ ഇനിയൊരവസരത്തിൽ—അന്നു നീക്കം തരാമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു വച്ചു നീട്ടിയിട്ട് വലിച്ചുകളഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നത് ഓർമ്മിക്കുവാനിടവരും.

ഒരാൾ യുദ്ധകാലത്തു തന്നെ കുറേ പുതുവലിന് ഇവിടെ അപേക്ഷിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. മിസ്റ്റർ, നാരായണൻ ദിവാൻജിയായിരുന്ന കാലത്തു അയാൾ മടങ്ങിവരുകയും, മുമ്പു കൊടുത്ത അപേക്ഷയിലെ സംഗതിയ്ക്കുതന്നെ വീണ്ടും ഒരപേക്ഷ കൊടുക്കുകയും ചെയ്തു. അപ്പോൾ ആ അപേക്ഷയിൽ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിരുന്ന കൺസഷൻസ് എല്ലാം വാത്സ്യം ചെയ്തതായി ഉത്തരവിട്ടു. മിസ്റ്റർ ഹെർബർട്ട് വന്നപ്പോൾ അയാൾ വീണ്ടും ഒരപേക്ഷ കൊടുത്തു.

എളുക്കുന്നപുഴ പുതുവൽ പതിയൂർമ്പോൾ ഈ അപേക്ഷയുടെകാലം കൂടി ശ്രദ്ധിക്കണമെന്നു ചിവാൻ ഉത്തരവിട്ടു. എന്നാൽ അയാൾക്ക് അതനുസരിച്ച് പുതുവൽ പതിച്ചു കിട്ടിയല്ല. കൊടുക്കാം കൊടുക്കണമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു അയാളെ താമസിപ്പിച്ചു. ഒരു മാസത്തിനുമുമ്പ് കൺസഷൻസ് ഇല്ല; വിത്ഡ്രാ ചെയ്തെന്നു ഉത്തരവിട്ടിരിക്കുന്നതായി അറിയുന്നു. കൺസഷൻസ് ചിൻവലിച്ചതുതന്നെ വാശലത്ത ലംഘനം. ഇയാളോട് കാണിച്ചതാകട്ടെ വാശലത്ത ലംഘനത്തിൽ വാശലത്ത ലംഘനമാണ്. ഇത് ജനങ്ങൾക്ക് എത്രത്തോളം സങ്കടം തോന്നത്തക്കവിധത്തിലുള്ള ഒരു സംഗതിയാണ്. പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ ചെയ്തുകൊടുത്തിരുന്നു വെങ്കൽ നിങ്ങൾക്ക് അത്രയും ജനങ്ങളുടെ പ്രീതിസമ്പാദിക്കാൻ സാധിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതിനു സംശയമില്ല. അവർക്ക് കറേ സ്ഥലം പതിച്ചുകൊടുത്താൽ മതി. ഉദ്യോഗങ്ങൾക്കു വല്ലതും ഒഴിവു വരുമ്പോൾ സൗകര്യം പോലെ അവർക്കും കൊടുക്കണം. അത് പ്രത്യേകിച്ചും പോലീസ് കമ്മീഷണർക്കു സാധിക്കും. ഇതൊക്കെ എത്ര പ്രയാസംകുറഞ്ഞ നിസ്സാര കാര്യങ്ങളാണ്.

പാലിയത്തേയ്ക്ക് അഞ്ഞൂറേക്കർ നെല്ല്, ലേഡി ടങ്കറൻ നായർ, ആർ എം. പാലാട്ട് ഇവർക്കൊക്കെ എത്ര പുതുവൽ പതിച്ചു കൊടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. തമ്പുരാക്കന്മാർക്കും നൈതാരമ്മമാർക്കും പുതുവൽ പതിച്ചു കൊടുക്കുന്നതിന്റെ കണക്കു ചോദിച്ചതിനെ ഇവിടെ അനുവദിച്ചില്ല. ചോദ്യം അനുവദിച്ചില്ലെങ്കിലും ചോദ്യം കൊണ്ട് ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചപ്പോൾ കറേ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ട്. (ചിരി) ഇങ്ങനെ ധാരാളം പണമുള്ളവർക്കും, സ്ഥലമുള്ളവർക്കും, വലിയ നിലയിലായിരിക്കുന്നവർക്കും പുതുവൽ പതിച്ചു കൊടുക്കുന്ന ഈ രാജ്യത്തിൽ, രാജ്യ ഭരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി—മേൽകോയ്മയുടെ ബഹുമാന്യർക്കു വേണ്ടി—കൊല്ലാനും ചാകാനും ഒരുങ്ങി ഇവിടെനിന്നു പോയി ബാക്കി ശരീരവും കൊണ്ട് തിരിച്ചുവന്ന ആളുകൾക്ക് നിസ്സാരമായ വല്ലതും കിട്ടണമെന്നുള്ള അപേക്ഷയെ ഗവണ്മെൻറ് നിരസിക്കുന്നതും അതിന് എത്രരായിനില്ക്കുന്നതും ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ പ്രസ്താവന ജനം ഒട്ടും യോജിച്ചതല്ല. എന്നുമാത്രമല്ല; ഹാനികരമായി തീരുന്നതുമാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ കാര്യം ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ദൃഷ്ടിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുവാനാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ മോഷൻ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചത്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. മഹമ്മദ് സിദ്ദീഖ്.—ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ പിൽ താങ്ങുന്നു. യുദ്ധത്തിനുപോയി തിരിച്ചു വന്നിട്ടുള്ള ആളുകളിൽ പലരും ഇന്നും പല സൗജന്യങ്ങളും കിട്ടാനിടയുണ്ടെന്നു വിചാരിച്ച് അലഞ്ഞു നടക്കുന്ന വിവരം ഞാൻ പറയാതെ ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്നറിയാവുന്നതാണ്. ഞാൻ തന്നെ ഇതു സംബന്ധിച്ച്

മിസ്റ്റർ നാരായണൻ്റെ ദിവാൻജിയായിരുന്ന കാലത്തു് ഗവണ്മെൻറിൻ്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയെ ക്ഷണിച്ചിരുന്നതായി ഓർക്കുന്നുണ്ടു്. ആ കാലത്തു് നിയമസഭയിൽ തന്നെ ഈ വിഷയകമായി ഞാൻ കുറെ ചോദ്യങ്ങൾ ചോദിച്ചിരുന്നു. ഞാൻ ചോദിച്ചതു് യുദ്ധത്തിനു പോയ ആളുകളുടെ എണ്ണം എത്രയാണെന്നും, അവർക്കു് കൊടുക്കാമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള സെഞ്ചനങ്ങൾ നിരസിച്ചിട്ടു് എത്ര കൊല്ലമായിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നും മറ്റുമായിരുന്നു. അതിനു് റവന്യൂ മെമ്പർ വ്യക്തമായ മറുപടികൾ തരികയുണ്ടായെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഇത്തരക്കാർ വളരെ ഉണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല; ചുരുക്കം പേരേയുള്ളു. അവരുടെ അപേക്ഷപ്രകാരമുള്ള സെഞ്ചനങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെൻ്റ് അനുവദിച്ചു കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതാണു്. അവർ ഗവണ്മെൻറിൻ്റെ പ്രതിജ്ഞകൾ വിശ്വസിച്ചായിരുന്നുവല്ലോ യുദ്ധത്തിനു പോയതു്. ആ വശം മില്ലാത്ത കാര്യത്തിനു പോയതിൻ്റെ ശരിയായ ഫലമായിരിക്കാം ഈ കൂട്ടർ അനുഭവിക്കുന്നതെന്നു ചിലപ്പോൾ എന്നിങ്ങു തോന്നാറുണ്ടു്. പക്ഷെ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു് അവരുടെ സെഞ്ചനങ്ങളെ നൽകാതിരിക്കുവാൻ യാതൊരു കാരണവുമില്ല. അതിനാൽ ഗവണ്മെൻ്റ് അവർക്കു് കൊടുക്കാമെന്നു സമ്മതിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള സെഞ്ചനങ്ങൾ നിറുത്തിക്കളയാതെ നൽകേണ്ടതാണെന്നു് വീണ്ടും അപേക്ഷിയ്ക്കുകയും, അതിലേയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി എൻ്റെ മാനിസ്റ്റേഫിതൻ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ബലമായി ചിന്താക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

രാമവർമ്മൻ.— യുദ്ധത്തിനു പോയി തിരിച്ചു വരുന്നവർക്കു് നിയമിച്ചിരുന്ന സെഞ്ചനങ്ങൾ ൧൯൨൦ ആഗസ്റ്റുമാസത്തലാണ് “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തതു്. അതു് യുദ്ധംകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടു് ഇവിടെ രണ്ടു കൊല്ലം വരെ നടപ്പിലുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. ബാക്കി എല്ലാ സ്റ്റേറ്റ്കളിലും “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തതോടു കൂടി ഇവിടെയും “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതാണു് എന്നാണു് തോന്നുന്നതു്. തിരിച്ചായിട്ടുള്ള അതിൻ്റെ വിവരങ്ങൾ നോക്കി പറയുവാൻ “ഫയൽസു്” ഇവിടെയില്ല. എങ്കിലും ബാക്കിയുള്ള സ്റ്റേറ്റ്കളിൽ “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തതിനാലായിരിയ്ക്കാം ഇവിടെയും അതു് “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ബ്രിട്ടീഷിലും തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലും മറ്റും അദ്ദേഹമായി “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തിരിയ്ക്കാം. ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് ഇമ്പീരിയൽ ഗവണ്മെണ്ടിൽ നിന്നും ഇതു് “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്യാമെന്നായി വല്ല കമ്യൂണിക്കേഷനും—ജനറൽ ഓർഡർ—കിട്ടിയിരിയ്ക്കാം. അങ്ങിനെ കിട്ടിയ ആർഡറിനെ വച്ചുകെണ്ടു് ഇവിടെയും “വീത്ഡ്രാ” ചെയ്തിരിയ്ക്കാമെന്നല്ലാതെ, ഇവിടെ മാത്രം ഭോഷമായി ഒന്നും ചെയ്തിരിയ്ക്കാനിടയില്ല. ഇങ്ങനെ കൊച്ചി ഗവണ്മെണ്ടു മാത്രം കഠിനമായിട്ടു ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള സംഗതിയായിരിയ്ക്കയില്ല ഇതു്. ഇതിൻ്റെ ഫയൽസെല്ലാം നോക്കി ഇപ്പോൾ ബാക്കിയുള്ള ഗവണ്മെണ്ടുകൾ എന്തെങ്കിലും ചെയ്തുവരുന്നുണ്ടെന്നു കണ്ടാൽ അതുപോലെ ഇവിടെയും ചെയ്യുവാൻ യാതൊരു വിരോധവുമില്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—ഗവണ്മെണ്ടു കഠിനത കാണിച്ചുവെന്ന് ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞില്ല. അനുകമ്പ കാണിയ്ക്കണമെന്നു മാത്രമേ ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നുള്ളൂ. മറ്റു ഗവണ്മെണ്ടുകൾ ഈ കൺസൈഷൻ സു “വിത” “സ്രാ” ചെയ്തു കൂട്ടിക്കൊടുക്കൽ നമ്മുടെ ഗവണ്മെണ്ടും അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യണമെന്നുണ്ടോ? മറ്റു ഗവണ്മെണ്ടുകൾ വാങ്ങാനു ലംഘനം ചെയ്യുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ നാമും അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യണമെന്നില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ ഇതിനെ പ്രസ്തു ചെയ്യുന്നു.

*The motion was put and carried.*

### Motion No. 9.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.*

Mr. President, Sir, the motion that stands in my name is tabled to press upon the Government the necessity for having some fixed rule regarding the appointment of backward and depressed class communities into the Government service consistently with the Government policy of encouraging these classes. What provoked me to table this motion was the reply given to me in answer to question No. 686 of the Legislative Session of this year. That question related to an application from a most unrepresented community in the State—Barbers, the applicant being one of the two young men who had passed the School Final Examination. The application for appointment was made as long ago as 1106, early part of 1106. The question was answered in Kumbham 1107. As a result of the information that I got from the applicant that the reply given to him was one referring him to the various departmental heads, all of whom he approached only to be told there are no vacancies, I had also asked whether any of our departmental heads had made during the period from the date of the application to the date of the question, any appointment either acting or permanent. I have been given an answer that as many as 150 acting appointments and about 10 permanent appointments have been made by our various departmental heads and they did not find their way to give one of these many appointments made by them to this most deserving candidate from a most unrepresented community. In answer to the question why it was not possible for the Government to give one of these appointments to that applicant, I was told that there were various considerations prevailing with the various departmental heads in making these appointments, the most important of them being ‘acting hands had to be provided’. In answer to another supplementary question of mine I got from the Hon’ble the Secretary that all the appointments were not made for providing acting hands, but there were other considerations also. Further question

followed and the answer came that there were applications from better qualified men. There was also the answer that there were applicants of similar qualifications and similarly situated, and finally the whole question was closed with the declaration from the Government to the effect—this is the Hon'ble Secretary's reply—'the only reply I can give is that the Government will stick to their declared policy, the declared policy being showing preference to backward and unrepresented communities'. That being the policy of the Government declared in those clear words, that is they will give preference to backward and unrepresented communities, and the practice being what I just now explained, it is highly desirable that the Government do make some fixed rules regarding the appointment of these men into the service. If they are told, being unrepresented and being depressed, you will not be taken here, there is an end of it. Not that we are going to be satisfied, but we are at least not kept in suspense. On the other hand, if the Government still stick to their policy to prefer backward and unrepresented communities by encouraging them, let it be put into action. I understand that the various departmental heads are labouring under various difficulties. My point in moving this cut is to request the Government to issue strict and definite instructions to the various departmental heads so that at least in the matter of appointment they may not be unnecessarily troubled. I do not say that any particular departmental head was biased in one way or the other, although there may be individual cases like that. The only difficulty which some of them expressed to me was that our hands must be strengthened by some definite instructions in that line from the Government. I only request that the Government may be pleased to do something definite. I hope it will be something favourable to the communities for whom I am now making these representations. Even an unfavourable answer is welcome, because there is no trouble of being kept in suspense. I therefore commend the motion for consideration by the House.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Sir, I should confess that this is the first time that I hear that the departmental heads have been puzzled over the right thing to do when making fresh appointments. They have been told times without number and quite definitely and without giving room for any kind of doubt, that when fresh vacancies arise backward community candidates should be given preference. That has been told unequivocally and this is the first time I hear that they have not understood the rules properly.

**Mr. George Chakyamuri.**—How was it that this Barber was not provided for?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—It is very difficult to comment upon particular instances. I do not remember the details. Anyhow since the Member says that Heads of Departments expressed to him the difficulty that they are feeling in the matter, Government absolutely have no objection to go into the matter and instruct them further.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

*Motion withdrawn with leave of the House.*

#### **Motion No. 10.**

**Deputy President.**—The next cut motion also stands in the name of Mr. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.*

Sir, the point of the motion as expressed in the Agenda is "to urge upon the Government the necessity of establishing an Executive Council to advise the Government on matters administrative". This was a subject which had been pressed upon the attention of the Government from the very beginning of the institution of this important House. Yesterday, it was very pleasing to note, in the reply given by the Leader of the House when he was disclosing information connected with the Harbour pointing out that side—there lies the Harbour, ships are landing there—in that strain he said that our observation on the General Administration, namely the introduction of the Executive Council, is something which falls very much short of the mark. He said we ought to agitate for a cabinet system of Government. He also said that the present cry for an Executive Council is something which looks childish. He characterised any Executive Council as antediluvian. Let the Hon'ble Leader know that we are not going to be carried away by the sweet words of the oldest member of the Treasury Benches and we still insist upon having an important institution like the Executive Council established at a time like this. I will not make further comments. The utility of an Executive Council being well known to all the Hon'ble Members on the other side as well as Hon'ble Members on this side, I do not wish to expatiate upon the subject. I leave the matter in the hands of the other Hon'ble Members of this House.

**Mr. George Chakyamuri.**—The resolution seems to be paradoxical. Does it mean Executive Council to administer the departments or Advisory Council?

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Sir, this is taken as a party question and I would request you to give me a minute or two more. When this question was moved some time ago under the Presidentship of Mr. Narayana Ayyar, he said that the question cannot be discussed in this Council, and as we were not inclined to question the ruling of the Chair, no decent body of members would ever question the ruling of the Chair however arbitrary it may be—we pocketed that observation and we did not bring forward this resolution. But times have changed and questions which have been tabooed were permitted to be discussed in this House. I fail to see the object of our presence here, if we could not give advice to the Government on matters of such momentous importance, and because the Government did not allow us to discuss such points, this Council, as has been observed by many members on various occasions, has degenerated into a Lower Secondary Debating Society. But times have changed and with the change of time the tone of the Council also, I believe, has improved. We have made observations from the time that this representative institution came into existence that an irremovable and an uncontrolled executive always produces an irresponsible opposition. It is very well exemplified in the history of this Council itself. Irresponsible criticisms were offered, some of them really irresponsible, I admit, and sometimes it was done intentionally and wilfully, because you were indulging as you like on the other side. Such irresponsible criticisms gradually have given place to responsible criticisms. If you want an illustration of this it is seen in the matter of the income-tax. No Legislative Council allows—irresponsible Legislative Council only allows—an additional imposition upon the people. Why is it?—because there is an improvement on the other side—there is at least an anxiety, a desire to carry out the recommendations of the Council, as far as they possibly could. It indicates, therefore, the more control we have upon you, the more responsible our opposition is and the more reasonable the criticism that is offered from this side. The moment you are placed under our control, then we realise that it is our duty to see that our criticisms and our observations should not be conducive or should not produce any difficulties to the Government. Now, it is a great pity that the Leader of the House with his agility of mind and with his subtlety of brain is not here to advise us against ourselves. He took it upon himself yesterday to say that what we proposed was so mild. In so many words he said that we would be fools to press for an Executive Council. He wanted us to reach the upper stairs without ladder; but

anybody who makes that attempt will realise the consequence of such an action. We wanted only to progress slowly and gradually, and we have no doubt that either this Council will come to an end or the Executive will be under its control, be it to-day or 20 years hence. There cannot be an irresponsible and irremovable executive and an irresponsible Legislative Council going hand in hand. You cannot have both ways. Either there should be a pure autocracy doing what you like or you should be placed under the control of the will of the representatives of the people. Now, if we have come to that stage, if you accept the inevitability of that proposition, then would it not be advisable, instead of effecting a startling and sudden change, to go through the various processes gradually and slowly, so that you may not feel the irksome nature of the control that will be imposed upon you? That will be imposed upon you, there is no doubt. Would it not be advisable to us, all of us, that such a control is imposed upon you in stages and gradually, so that you may not feel it very irksome? I think it is the duty of this House occasionally to bring forward to the notice of the Government the desire of the representatives of the people who come here, that they would like to have some sort of control over the administration and the best means of control is to have an Executive, because it follows that an Executive Council need not be an Executive Council of Officials just as in British territory. A portion of the members of the Executive Council will be dependent upon the major vote of this Council. Otherwise an Executive Council consisting of permanent officials is of no more use to us than the present administration. And further as I have said, there is the safety in the number. I honestly believe that had there been an Executive Council even of Government officials, the Port would not have shared this fate; our birthright would not have been written away like this; what Providence has given us would not have been given to other people without the least hesitation whatsoever, because the whole administration is dependent upon a single Diwan's will and that Diwan failing to realise his duties and responsibilities, wrote away our birthright, what Providence has given us. Therefore it is high time that such uncontrolled action, such irresponsible action is come to an end. Otherwise one day we will see that the State itself is written away. This is the very reason that prompted us, why this House has again taken it up as a pressing question, so that Cochin State itself may not be written away by you gentlemen sitting on the other side.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—Sir, I support the motion. The Government need not be under any wrong impression regarding the

object of this motion. Whether what we have demanded is antediluvian or not, our request is clear enough; if not, we want to make it clear. We want to end the one-man's rule. The object of this House is that the power that one man is now wielding must be shared by the representatives of the people. No more should the administration of the State be a one-man's show. That is the purpose of this motion. The motion may be viewed from this stand point. What the non-official members desire is to share the power with you and not to continue the shows of one man. Now, Sir, I need not dilate upon the several mistakes that the Government has committed during the last quarter of a century, all being the mistakes of the man at the head. No income-tax would have been necessary, no salary cut would have been necessary. Go through the budget statements and Administration Reports for the last quarter of a century and you will see if proper advice was taken and acted upon you would have saved at least a crore and half of rupees. Why, how much did you spent on the Viceroy's visit? Was it not nearly 6 lakhs of rupees? Is the Cochin State big enough or rich enough to spend such a big sum. How many Commanders-in-Chief and how many Governors have been entertained here. If container can indicate the contents how many steamers and how many cruisers have been entertained? What is the meaning of all this? Is it not the poor tax payers' money that is spent? All this I say is the result of one-man-rule. And we want to end that one-man-rule. Whether it is antediluvian or whether it is modern, an Executive Council would effectively check the autocracy of the one-man who administers. I fully sympathise with the Leader of the House. He is one who has gone out and has come back again. And we hear from him that these are antediluvian. I can only meet it with a smile.

**Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.**—I too have very great pleasure in supporting this motion. No doubt it is an old topic upon which much discussion has taken place on the floor of this House. But it often happens that it requires too many hammerings to produce an impression, and especially in the case of officials too many hammerings seem to be necessary to bring home the importance of this subject. I do not want to repeat the arguments now. But, at this moment in the history of the State, when important problems are awaiting solution, the creation of an Executive Council to advise the Government is to my mind absolutely essential. It is also essential in securing consistency of policy. We have been erring, and erring egregiously for the last 15 years in our policy of administration. The people's mind would be brought clearer home to

the Government by the creation of an Executive Council. Upon those grounds and for reasons urged by my Hon'ble friends here today I support this motion.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Sir, I quite understand the position of the Hon'ble Members on the other side. This was one of the points that I think I very briefly touched when I moved for the allotment this morning. I then said that the advantage of mutual consultation that one might receive from an Executive Council we are in a way deriving from our conference with the Heads of Departments. As regards the check that it could exercise upon the administration, I said that the House, as constituted today, has a strong voice and constituted as it is with a very large non-official majority can effectively tell upon the policy of the Government as it has been doing for the past half a dozen years.

**Mr. C. A. Ouseph.**—It can only bark.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I do admit that an Executive Council with non-officials as members will be still more effective. There is no gainsaying that fact, and if I dispute the fact it will only be exhibiting an utter ignorance of human nature. That is a fact too patent and I do not want to go against admitted facts. But it has to be considered whether this is not a question that could with more propriety and with more advantage be deferred for consideration to a later date. I do not mean by later date years hence. But the whole of India and along with it the Indian States are passing through critical stages of constitutional development and it will be only fitting in my opinion if this question is taken for earnest consideration after we know exactly where the State is with regard to the future constitution of India and other Governments. And further in every other State where there is an Executive Council the tendency is to retrench upon the members of the staff themselves and to reduce their numbers to cut down the top-heavy expenditure of the general administration. In view of this the natural tendency here also should be to avert expenditure on this account as far as possible. I do not mean that this question should be shelved. I do not say that this question should be indefinitely postponed. There is considerable force in what the Honourable Members on the other side said. But the situation is not as bad or as gloomy as it was sketched. We are responding to the public wishes and as admitted by the Members themselves this House is not a mere debating society, but this House has influence over the executive, which, I fear, it may not have, when this side is elected. When this side is elected and when this side is supported by a majority, I declare that the influence of the

Opposition on that side will be considerably diminished and it is yet to be seen how far a ministry will be a much greater success than the Government that is constituted today. Anyhow it cannot but be admitted that the voice of the opposition will be dwindled. I do not say that this statement applies to all States outside India. But in India in the Councils as they are constituted today I do say that the opposition has far far greater influence upon the Government of the day than it would have when the country has an elected ministry. An elected ministry may tend to do anything, but the Government of today standing upon the vote of this House for expenditure of even a rupee under many of the votable heads will think twice, will think half a dozen times before doing anything that might wound the majority feelings of the other side. With the non-officials not so strong the situation would have been different. Then the Council would have been a mockery. Here the situation is quite different. Raise the small finger and the Government can be defeated and would any Government be able to stand successive defeats of the majority even when the majority have not got the power. Therefore Sir, I submit that the picture is not so gloomy as it is sketched. There is some force in what the Hon'ble Members say. But I submit that it is not quite the opportune time to discuss this question. I am not for solving that question. I am not for indefinitely postponing that. Wait some time more. Let the new constitution for India be fully drafted and let the present financial crisis pass. Let us have some more money at our disposal. Let us be able to spend more on General Administration and then would be the correct time to press this home to the Government. Therefore I submit that it be deferred to a later date.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan**—Sir, the reply from the Government side in some respects satisfies this side of the House. The point that these are not the proper times for taking up the question is something which appeals to us. But the argument of responsiveness although we appreciate it, to the degree that it has been given to us, is something which does not completely satisfy us. It is enough if I only refer to the attitude of the Treasury Benches when a censure motion upon one of its own members happened to be passed by this Council. The certification powers still vest in the Government. When these questions are considered, I don't find that there is any necessity for pressing this motion. But then again another aspect of the thing was also mentioned—the expenditure to be incurred if the proposition is to be acted upon. That is not anything which is alarming. Necessary funds will have to be provided and the question that was raised in other provinces about the top-heavy

administration and the necessity for reducing expenditure, that is a matter which can well be solved by making the proper remedies even at the time of the institution of the Council. Fat salaries as are given in other provinces, of course, do not obtain here and there is no fear on that score. But the other argument to the effect that the Government themselves are not averse to the idea altogether, the only objection being that these are not proper times, is something which appeals to us and with such words coming from the other side, I do not wish to press this motion.

*The motion was, with leave, withdrawn.*

### Motion No. 11.

**Deputy President.**—The next motion also stands in the name of Mr. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.*

Sir, I am sorry that these cuts one after the other appear against my name and I have often to stand up and perhaps annoy the House. But the one cut motion that I have now to move is something which must rivet the attention of the House. What induced me to send up this cut motion, the moment I perused the preliminary budget that was sent to us a week back, was the position that the Government stated in the explanatory statement of the budget to the effect that there is necessity, because of the prevailing conditions, even to go to the extent of cutting the salaries of persons drawing even a salary of Rs. 40 per mensem. I was in the first instance glad to find that the Government had accepted a resolution that was passed in this House during the Legislative session. But when I found that the Government had gone much beyond the recommendations of this House and that to the prejudice of the low paid officer, it struck me that it is necessary to press home to the Government and also to the Hon'ble Members on the non-official side the nature of the resolution that was passed by them in this House against the opposition of the Government. To the Hon'ble Members on the non-official side I have only to say that consistency on their part requires that they should see that the salaries below Rs. 100 are not cut. Consistency again requires that salaries above Rs. 100 be cut not at the uniform rate of 10 per cent, but at the rates suggested at the time of the discussion of the resolution referred to or to make it more equitable at the percentage shown in this cut motion varying from 5 to 20. In the Proceedings published in the Government Gazette regarding the salary cut there is a paragraph which says that the income-tax which the

Government propose to introduce and which they expect to be passed into Law about the middle of the year will absorb the salary cut also. It was pointed out by this side of the House during the general discussion on the budget that the point was very clear that the object of the Government was to see that the high salaried persons are not affected by the cut as much as the low paid men. The question that the cut is absorbed in the income-tax when it is introduced and collected does not affect the person drawing salaries up to Rs. 80. The cut introduced by the Government affects salaries from Rs. 40 to 80 at 5 per cent. Rs. 80 man has no taxable salary. His annual income is only Rs. 960 and even if the rates and taxable income contained in the Income-Tax Bill are accepted as they stand, an officer of the Government drawing Rs. 80 is not affected by the income-tax. Hence that clause regarding merger is absolutely of no use to him. That clause only benefits persons drawing salaries above Rs. 100. The position of the low-paid man who draws Rs. 40—and he began to draw Rs. 40 only very recently—is one which must appeal to any man with a heart. Our officers are almost all of them persons who are big family men. On an average it may be taken that the man of Rs. 40 income has to feed at least 10 souls. There will be his children who attend school. There are various other items of expenditure that he has to incur. One argument that will be advanced against the position that I take up that the salary cut may not affect persons below Rs. 100 is that the cost of living has become cheaper and hence the man of Rs. 40 is not going to be seriously affected. But in the case of a man getting Rs. 40 even the apparently slight reduction of his pay by Rs. 2 will seriously affect him. The only item of necessity which has gone down in price is rice, not many other things. There will be no reduction of school fees on the ground that the salary is cut. There will also be no reduction of payment in all other money commitments of his. It is only in one solitary item, *viz.*, rice, that he may not have to spend as much as he was spending before. That cannot be an argument to cut his salary. And the total income that is expected from the salary cut as proposed by the Government is about 85,000 rupees of which it is only about Rs. 30,000 that will be had by cutting the salaries of persons below Rs. 100 per mensem. I will give statistics. From 40 to 79 it will work about Rs. 25,000 and from 80 to 100 it will be about Rs. 6,000. In round figures, we will be getting from the officers below Rs. 100 a monthly saving of about Rs. 30,000. That is an item of income which we can well do without. There are various items of expenditure in the budget

that is presented before us which could safely lie over for another year. The difficulty as pointed out by the Government in the Proceedings is only that it may take time before we are in a position to collect the income-tax and because of the depression there may be difficulties in the way, we may not be in a position to realise all the income that we expect to get from revenue and other items.

**Deputy President.**—The Hon'ble Member's time is up.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Sir, I will wind up. The fact that the Income-Tax Bill has already been referred to a Select Committee and the time for reporting upon that is also given as two months and that the expenditure on the side of income-tax comes for a vote of the House as is seen from the Supplementary Agenda, all these clearly show that the Government is going to work up that branch of business very vigorously. As we are now sure that we are going to have an Income-tax Bill the argument advanced by the Government is not one which helps the Government. There is no necessity to cut the salary of persons drawing below Rs. 100. It is very hard upon them. It is absolutely necessary that the Government does not extend the cut to persons drawing salaries below Rs. 100. As regards the other, there is no necessity for any further argument. It is the graded pay that they get and the percentage of cut must necessarily be graded.

മാസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—ഈ നിയമത്തോടു മുഴുവൻ അനുകൂലിയായ്കാൻ നിയമത്തിലില്ലാത്തതിൽ ഞാൻ വ്യസനിക്കുന്നു. വെട്ടുന്നത് മുറിയുവാൻ വേണ്ടി മാത്രമല്ല; വല്ലതും കിട്ടുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയുമായിരിക്കും. നൂറുരൂപയ്ക്കു താഴെ വെട്ടുവീണില്ലെങ്കിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റുടേതായിരിക്കുന്ന മാതിരിയിലുള്ള ഫലം കിട്ടുകയില്ല. ഇതിനു മുമ്പുണ്ടായിരുന്നതിൽ കുറവായിട്ടാണ് ഇപ്പോൾ ജീവനത്തത്തിൽ ഉള്ള ചിലവ്. സാമാന്യവില അതു കുറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം ശരിയ്ക്കു ഫലപ്പെടണമെങ്കിൽ രൂപാക്കരയും കട്ടിൽനിന്നും ഒഴിവാക്കേണ്ടതെന്നാണ് എനിയ്ക്കു പരിഭവമുള്ളത്. അവരോടേനിയ്ക്കു ചെയ്തില്ലാത്തതില്ല. അവർ രൂപായെങ്കിലും ഉണ്ടല്ലോ എന്നൊരു സമാധാനമുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ രൂപാപോലും ഇല്ലാതെ എന്തുപർ—ഇപ്പോൾ എത്ര ഗ്രാഡുവോടുകൂടുന്നതെന്ന്—കാടി നടക്കുന്നു? പണം കിട്ടുവാനുള്ള അവസരത്തിനുവേണ്ടിയാണ് വെട്ടുന്നത്. അത് അവർക്കൊരു ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടായി തോന്നരുത്. നൂറിനു മുകളിൽ ശമ്പളം വാങ്ങുന്നവരുടെ ശമ്പളത്തിൽ വെട്ടുന്ന വെട്ട് ഒന്നുകൂടി ആഴത്തിൽ വെട്ടണം. അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ചെറുതുരുത്തി മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞതുപോലെ സാലാരികൾ

ട്ട് വച്ചിരുന്നതു അവരെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം അത്ഭുതികരമായതാകാം. അതുകൊണ്ട് താഴെയുള്ളവരുടെ ശമ്പളത്തിൽ കട്ട ചെയ്ക്കാൽ ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടുണ്ടാകുമെന്നു പറയുന്നവരോട് ഞാൻ യോജിക്കുന്നില്ല. അതുംവേണം. എന്നാൽ മുകളിൽ ഉള്ളവരുടെ ശമ്പളത്തിലെ കട്ട് ഇപ്പോൾ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതല്ലെന്നു കണ്ടുകിട്ടി അതിൽ വെട്ടണമെന്നു ഞാൻ പറയുന്നുള്ളു. മുകളിൽ കൂടി കൂടി വരുത്താൻ വെട്ടുന്നതിന്റെ ആദ്യം കൂടി കൂടി വരണം.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—Sir, I am more certain about my mathematics to-day than I was last time. I have now worked out the figures. The point is this. During the Standing Finance Committee meeting when this matter was brought forward we took objection to any reduction being made in the pay of those below Rs. 100. But the Hon'ble the Secretary to the Diwan advanced an argument which I could not meet. He said that the only objection you could raise against the cut is that the Government don't cut the pay of the peon, because the principle on which the cut is made is that the money value is higher and the purchasing power is as much higher. If that is so, it makes no difference either to the peon or to the Diwan. Now, I understood, all intelligent men and all reasonable men, excepting men who are in deadlock, have understood that these two are separate and missing links. There is a passage published in the Government Gazette the meaning of which nobody has yet understood. My interpretation seems to be the correct one from the argument you raised here. What is the fun of saying that you are cutting your pay without paying income-tax? The income-tax which five of you pay—the big guns—the Diwan, the Chief Judge and I have taken only three who are drawing Rs. 800—let us see what they will pay. It will come to Rs. 438 as income-tax and Rs. 540 as cut. The difference is Rs. 102 only a month among five of you. I honestly think that income-tax is quite sufficient without a cut. You must pay income-tax and should not take the credit that your pay has been cut, when you do not feel any sacrifice. We do not want to see you pretending that you have sacrificed a ten per cent of your salaries when you are not really losing it. You are not doing any sacrifice. In the total salary of nearly Rs. 7,000 the damage you pay to the State is only Rs. 102. That is not a very fair amount. Therefore either you shall pay income-tax kept apart from the cut or you need not have a cut in salaries at all. Introduce income-tax for all; then I have no objection whether by that you cut the salary of those who draw even from Rs. 40—80. All of you must pay income-tax. It is sufficient. It is very difficult to get fine

words to criticise you in the face of your action which may not be capable of being called unparliamentary. Either you take us to be all fools or we would be compelled to take you which I do not like to mention in the House. Government must be a little serious when they come forward with such proposals. This morning the Hon'ble the Secretary to the Government told us that they have brought in the cut, because they were altogether uncertain whether they would be able to introduce the Income-tax Bill. The Income-tax Bill is introduced and it will come into law within six months. Therefore the reason for this cut is obviously not clear. My proposition to the House is let us do away with the cut. Let all the gentlemen pay income-tax and in the grading of income-tax we will make proposals when the proper time comes. The grading as is seen now is Rs. 1,000 to 2,000, Rs. 2,000 to 5,000 and then to Rs. 10,000, because all of you come under 10,000. I deliberately charge you with the crime of having omitted a third group coming up to Rs. 7,500. This you have not done, because all of you will have to pay an increased rate. You are very anxious to safeguard your own interest and at the same time you want to tax the Rs. 40 clerks. The pay of the Rs. 40 clerks may also be cut, provided you too are willing to bear your burden and not casting upon the poor people alone the burden. It is only on these grounds that I support this motion.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—Sir, the Member for Cheruviruthi said that income-tax alone would do and that the cut may be left out altogether. We quite agree with that. If we were able to assure ourselves that the whole amount of 2 lakhs that has been shown as the probable receipt under income-tax will be realised next year, then there would have been no cut at all in salaries.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—More you will realise.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—But I think it will take some time more. After the Bill is passed a new department has to be organised. Further the income-tax being a vexatious taxation and since this is the first time the State is going to experience the effects of this tax nobody can really be sure that how much of our anticipated revenue will be collected next year. If we had been able to introduce the Bill in the current year and get it entered into the statute book then we may have been on surer grounds. Now we are not so sure. Who knows that the Select Committee's report will be coming within two months? Who knows it will not be delayed further by deliberations in the Council? Therefore I say let us not be quite sure of the entire

income-tax revenue—And accept it that this was what led the Government to the cuts. With regard to the other point viz. why not have a graded scale of cut instead of a flat rate, I should inform the House that the purchasing value of money having fallen down the most logical course is to have a flat rate of cut throughout.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—In the place of income-tax?

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—This I have already explained to the House.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—It did not; that is our conviction.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—To resume my line of argument Sir, there is great difference between a temporary cut and permanent reduction in pay. If it was a permanent reduction of pay all that the Member for Vadakkancheri said is right. When it is a temporary cut just for a specific purpose and based upon the fact that the purchase value of money has risen then the most logical course is to have a flat rate throughout. Of course logic is not fact. Therefore concessions have been made. In British India, the House will note, that from Rs. 40 to the highest rate it is a flat rate of 10 per cent throughout and that is more logical than what we have done.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—What do you say about income-tax? In British income-tax is kept separate from the cut. That is our point.

**Deputy President.**—The member should not make interruptions.

**Dr. A. R. Menon.**—It is a legitimate interruption. I am only trying to make the point at issue clearer.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I do not mind interruption at all. I simply state that the necessity of the cut would not have arisen at all if the Income-tax Bill had got into the statute book by this time. Because the Bill has not been passed we are rather uncertain about the revenue and it is because of our uncertainty we have resorted to the temporary cut. And since the cut is based on the fact of fall in prices the most logical course is to have a flat cut throughout. In British India it has been done, but logic is not fact, concessions have to be given and therefore in the smaller grade of 40 to 80 we have introduced a lower percentage.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—Sir, I beg to oppose this cut.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—My reply should be regarded as the final reply of the Government. I cannot make successive replies like this.

**Deputy President.**—The Government have placed their views and only after ascertaining the Government views the

other members can meet the arguments advanced by the Government. If the Hon'ble Secretary is not willing to make replies he may not do that.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—It is also humanly impossible, Sir, to make replies like this with the same consistency of argument with the same force and vigour.

**Mr. K. Ayyappan.**—Will figures change, Sir?

**Deputy President.**—The members will be able to answer only after knowing the view of the Government and the Secretary has expressed the Government view. If he is not willing to make any further replies he need not do so.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—If the reply is not made the cut will be carried, that is all.

**Deputy President.**—Then the Secretary should not be anxious about the number of replies that he has to make.

**Mr. Joseph Pettah.**—Sir, I oppose this motion not because I have no heart for people drawing Rs. 40 and upwards up to Rs. 100, but because I, too, think, as the Hon'ble Member for South Ezhuvass thought, that the pay cut is intended to produce some funds, which might be utilised to the benefit of those who are in worse plight than the officials receiving salaries ranging from Rs. 40 to 80. We see that the Government have decided to abolish four registry offices. This and similar other measures, it is evident, would lead to the throwing out of many hands from service. Now, instead of such retrenchment, leading to the unemployment and destitution of many, would it not be much better that a lower pay is given to all? That would be a more generous measure than to refrain from cutting the pay of people with salaries ranging from Rs. 80 to 100. Then there is the question of the rates. As the Secretary has said, the more logical position in regard to pay cut would be a flat rate. For, the purpose of the cut is to restore conditions to what they were before the present depression. For example, let us look at the case of two men receiving respectively Rs. 40 and Rs. 100 some time ago, since then the value of money has increased at least by 2 annas in the rupee, so that the man of Rs. 40 will find his income substantially increased to Rs. 45 and the man of Rs. 100 to Rs. 112-8-0. Now if you want to restore both of them to their original position, you will allow to take Rs. 5 from the former and Rs. 12-8-0 from the latter, which would be the same percentage. Yet we do not take the same percentage, because, as the Secretary has said, logic is not fact and some consideration has to be shown to the man of the lower income. I fully agree with the Secretary on this point. But then, for the

same reason, I would suggest a higher percentage of cut for the very high salaries. Every one will admit that there is a wide range between Rs. 80 and Rs. 800. What I would, therefore, propose is this: let us have a cut of 10 per cent on salaries ranging from Rs. 80 to, say, Rs. 300, and a cut of still higher percentage on salaries above Rs. 300.

Then again, there is the question whether the income-tax should be merged in the salary cut, or the two should be kept separate. The Hon'ble the Secretary to the Government has been telling us that there would not have been any necessity for the salary-cut, had the Government been sure of the income-tax. But I maintain that even if there is the income-tax there would still remain the urgent necessity for a salary-cut (*Hear hear*). The purpose to be served by the income-tax is not the same as the purpose to be served by the cut. The cut is intended to equalise the position as between officials receiving a salary and non-officials or professional men receiving an income. What the cut would be doing for the officials the depression has already done for the non-officials. Take the case of a salaried official receiving Rs. 200 and that of a vakil who was receiving Rs. 200 or again that of a merchant who was also receiving Rs. 200. On account of the economic depression the vakil is now getting Rs. 180 or even less and what the merchant gets would also be considerably less than Rs. 200; while the salaried official is still getting Rs. 200. Hence the necessity of the cut. Thus, what the economic depression has done in the case of the vakil and the merchant, the cut is intended to do in the case of the salaried official. Now when both of them are thus on an equal footing, the former on account of economic depression and the latter on account of the cut,—while their respective positions are thus equalised—the income-tax falls equally on all. I do not find any justification at all in not introducing the salary-cut on account of the income-tax, or in not introducing the income-tax on account of the cut. The two must stand separately and on independent grounds (*Hear, hear*). There is no logic in merging the two. In British India they have kept the two separate to a very large extent. There, in British India, they have put a surcharge on incomes, to the extent of 12½ per cent of the income-tax for 1930—'31, and 25 per cent for 1931—'32. It is this surcharge that they have merged in the salary cut. Even this, I would say, is unreasonable. For, as I said above, there is no logic in merging the two.

There is yet another objection to the motion before the House. If it is passed, I am afraid the Government might accept the first part of it, rejecting the second. The first part

says that no cuts should be imposed on those who are drawing below Rs. 100. That may be quite good for the Government. But the second part insists on raising the percentage of the cut progressively up to 20 per cent, which may not be acceptable to the Government. I would strongly protest against such partial and discriminating acceptance of the motion. If they are going to accept the motion it must be accepted *in toto*. But since I am afraid they would not so accept it, I oppose the motion. I also oppose the motion, because I feel that a flat rate is more suited to the purpose of a salary-cut. I also strongly protest against the merging of the income-tax in the salary cut.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—I would just add one word more and it is simply this. The member for Adoor himself admitted that a flat rate is the most logical procedure to be undertaken in this particular instance. His only objection was that since income-tax will be merged to some extent in the pay cut the two should be kept quite distinct. His objection therefore is confined to the merging of income-tax in the salary cut. But this does not come in the resolution.

**Deputy President.**—The resolution does not contain the question of income-tax. The only question is salary cut. Therefore the voting will be only on the question of the salary cut. The members might have made some remarks on income-tax. But that does not matter.

**Rama Varmah Tampuran.**—I have no objection if the voting will not be on that aspect of the question.

**Deputy President.**—I think we will have to confine to the resolution itself. There is nothing in it about income-tax.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—If the Government will agree with the separation of the income-tax from the salary cut, I may perhaps ask for the leave of the House to change my motion.

**Deputy President.**—That is not the issue here. The motion contains only about the salary cut. You cannot merge income-tax with salary cut.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—I think I can change the wording of the resolution now, under the rules.

**Deputy President.**—No. You cannot do it now.

**Rama Varmha Tampuran.**—This point I explained in the morning. Doubtless the figures have to be worked in detail. If there is any great anomaly on account of the merging that anomaly will be rectified. The question of income-tax in itself is a very intricate question and it becomes all the more complicated when the question of cuts also has to be considered with it. Therefore this requires careful study. If there are great

anomalies they will of course be rectified. That assurance I can give again now.

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Sir, I find myself in an awkward position. Even if I get an assurance from the Government that the income-tax and the salary cut will be separated or at least an assurance that great anomalies if they present themselves when details are worked out, will be removed, the ruling of the Chair stands in the way of my changing the wording of the motion. So I have to stick to the original motion, as it stands, and in doing so, I will only say this. What I could gather from the proceedings of the Government published in the Gazette is that there is necessity on the part of the Government that unless they resort to salary cut even on Rs. 40 and upwards, they may find themselves in an awkward position with a deficit budget which at all time was their attempt to avoid. I have shown that the amount that could be had from the cut of the salaries of those who draw below Rs. 100 is not anything more than 30 thousand rupees and if the other portion of the resolution, that the cut should be of one of varying percentage from 5 to 20 as the pay increases, at least a portion of the amount that will be lost by the Government in not extending cut to persons drawing less than 100 rupees will be made up by the increase on the other. What I can understand from the proceedings of the Government is that their object was simply to see that the delay in the working of the income-tax, and many other changes that may arise on account of depression in the market, did not affect the budgetary position of the State. It was to make up the necessary amount that they adopted this drastic cut. When I say that the amount that they stand to lose is only 30 thousand of which a portion can be made up by working on the other side and there are various other items in the Budget, the expenditure for which would very well stand over for one or two years in these days of depression, I fail to see why a portion of this side of the House is reluctant to do bare justice to the low paid men in the service. Whatever be the result of voting I wish to press the motion. I will appeal to the non-official members on this side of the House at least to be consistent with what they did when the resolution on the salary cut was passed by this House in Kumbhom last. There is no circumstances established for them to change their old position. So I appeal to the non-official side to vote enblock for the motion.

*The motion was put and negatived..*

**Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—A poll Sir.

## VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

375

*The House divided—Ayes 8 and Noes 16.***Ayes.**

|                            |                               |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 Mr. A. Eachara Menon     | 5 Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar |
| 2 „ P. Krishna Menon       | 6 Dr. A. R. Menon             |
| 3 „ T. K. Nayar            | 7 Mr. A. Sankara Poduval      |
| 4 „ P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan | 8 Mrs. Swaris                 |

**Noes.**

|                                |                             |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon | 9 Mr. C. J. Mathew          |
| 2 „ K. Ayyappan                | 10 „ I. N. Menon            |
| 3 „ M. A. Chacko               | 11 „ T. Narayana Menon      |
| 4 „ E. Ikkanda Warriar         | 12 „ P. Nilakanda Menon     |
| 5 „ Joseph Pettah              | 13 Dr. D. Raghavendra Rao   |
| 6 „ U. Kandar Menon            | 14 Rama Varmha Tampuran     |
| 7 „ K. P. Kannan Nayar         | 15 Mr. P. V. Raphael        |
| 8 „ P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri    | 16 „ P. V. Subramania Ayyar |

*The following motions lapsed under Rule 49.*

12. Mr P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1

(To urge upon the Government the extreme necessity for generally exempting the few English knowing unpassed hands now in service from the operation of Standing Order No. 1 to make them eligible for drawing Rs. 25—40.)

13. Mr. K. P. Vallon.—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.

(തൊഴിലാളി വർഗ്ഗങ്ങളുടെ രക്ഷയെ മുൻനിർത്തി തൊഴിൽസമയം ക്ലിപ്തപ്പെടുത്തിയും കുറഞ്ഞുകൂലി നിശ്ചയപ്പെടുത്തിയും നിയമം ചേണമെന്നുള്ളതിനെപ്പറ്റി ധാരണയുണ്ടാകട്ടെ).

14. Dr. A. R. Menon.—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.

(To discuss the undesirability of granting scholarships in foreign countries when qualified hands are available here).

15. Dr. A. R. Menon.—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.

(To call the attention of the Government to the desirability of making rules to the effect that members of the Legislative Council shall not appear as Vakils before the Diwan or the Heads of Departments).

16. Mr. P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,703 for General Administration by Re. 1.

(To protest against the system of extending the period of retirement of the Government officials).

*The demand minus Rs. 2 was put and carried.***10. General Administration—Cranganur—Rs. 1,720**

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Sir, I rise to move for an amount of Rs. 1,720 under 10—General Administration—Cranganur. There are no special features to deserve any mention in this particular budget. It is just a repetition of the budgets of previous years. I therefore request that this amount may be passed by this House.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—Sir, I wish to make a few observations with regard to the Cranganur Budget in General. It is very unfortunate that this House has had to consider two